DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 221 HE 018 256

AUTHOR	Bowker, Lee H.; And Others
TITLE	The Administration of the Liberal Arts in American Colleges and Universities.
INSTITUTION	Indiana Univ. of Pennsylvania. Graduate School.
PUB DATE	Feb 85
NOTE	142p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Deans; Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Responsibility; College Instruction; College Programs; Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; Job Satisfaction; *Liberal Arts; National Surveys; *Program Administration; Program Evaluation; Research Projects; *Resource Allocation

ABSTRACT

A national study of liberal arts academic officers and institutional support of excellence in liberal arts teaching and research was conducted in 1984. Usable questionnaire responses were received from 371 of 738 chief liberal arts academic officers, representing church-related colleges, private colleges, and state colleges. The officers had worked in their current positions for an average of just under 5 years. They held 46 different titles that could be classified as follows: 43 percent were liberal arts deans, 14 percent were arts and sciences deans, and 40 percent were vice-presidents (including provosts). Information is also provided on the administrators' doctoral degree disciplines, self-assessment of their career success, occupational plans, degree of job security, job responsibilities, sources of job satisfaction and frustration, the frequency of department or program evaluation, factors important in the assessment of programs, support categories most and least likely to receive good or excellent funding, the major emphases in the professional activity of liberal arts faculty; and factors that might affect tenure decisions and merit salary increases. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED256221

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LIBERAL ARTS IN AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

LEE H. BOWKER

DAVID N. LYNCH

J. RICHARD McFERRON

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lee H. Bowker
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

iup

The Graduate School

HE 018256

BEST COPY A

IUP, Pa.'s fifth largest institution of higher education, is a state-supported university located 50 miles northeast of Pittsburgh in the beautiful community of Indiana, Pa. The university consists of seven colleges and two schools, and offers 13 degrees, from the A.A. through the Ph.D. The university's 12,500 students have over 100 majors from which to choose in 40 departments. IUP also supports two branch campuses, one in Punxsutawney and one in Kittanning.

IUP is most proud of its selection by Barron's Guide to the Most Prestigious Colleges, 1982, as one of the nation's 227 academic best and of its selection by a prominent business magazine as one of the nation's 50 colleges or universities with high academic standing but tuition and fees below the national average.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LIBERAL ARTS IN AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

By

Lee H. Bowker
Dean of the Graduate School and Research

David M. Lynch
Associate Graduate Dean for Administration

J. Richard McFerron
Assistant Director for Academic Systems and
Research, Computer Center

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

February 1985

A publication of the Institute for Advanced Research
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Introduction 9

Description of the Sample 11

II. Careers of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 18

Career Success of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers . . . 22

III. Administrative Conditions and Administrative Behavior of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 37

Administrative Behavior of the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer 40

Evaluating Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 48

Job Satisfactions and Job Frustrations of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 51

IV. Department and Program Evaluation 57

Factors in Department and Program Assessments by Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 62

V. Grants Administration 75

VI. Resources in Support of Excellence in Teaching and Research . . 83

VII. Teaching and Formal Reward Structures for Faculty 93

Factors in Tenure Decisions 98

Merit Salary Increases 110

The Inconsistency Among Resources, Standards, and Rewards in Colleges and Universities 121

A Note About Faculty Unionization 123

VIII. Executive Summary 125

LIST OF TABLES

Page

1. Student Body Size 12

2. Number of FTE Administrators Responsible for the Liberal Arts . . 14

3. FTE Faculty and Staff in the Liberal Arts Unit 15

4. FTE Students Served by the Liberal Arts Unit 16

5. Chronological Career Development of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 19

6. Doctoral Degree Disciplines of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 21

7. Self-Defined Salary Success of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 23

8. Self-Defined Career Success of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 24

9. Impact of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers on Educational Quality 25

10. Feelings of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers About Their Institutions 26

11. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Careers of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 28

12. Relationship Between Institutional Sponsorship and the Chief Liberal Arts Officer's Feelings About the Institution 30

13. Relationship Between the Proportion of Departments and Programs That Are Outstanding and the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Feelings About the Institution 31

14. Regression of the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Feelings About the Institution on Selected Institutional Characteristics and Conditions 33

15. Relationship Between Student Body Size and the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Impact on Educational Quality 34

LIST OF TABLES

Page

16. Regression of the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Self-Defined Salary Success on Selected Institutional Characteristics and Conditions 36

17. Prevalence of Faculty Advisory Committees to the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer 38

18. Frequency With Which Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers Follow the Advice of Faculty Advisory Committees 39

19. Influence of Faculty Advisory Committees on Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 41

20. Teaching Responsibilities of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 42

21. Administrative Control of Student Processing and Financial Aid Decisions 44

22. Relationship Between Actual and Ideal Time Usage by Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 45

23. Major Committee Memberships of the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer 47

24. Frequency of Formal Evaluations of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 49

25. Evaluators of the Administrative Performance of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 50

26. Major Job Satisfactions of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 52

27. Major Job Frustrations of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 54

28. Proportion of Departments and Programs Judged to be Outstanding by Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 58

29. Resource Allocation Policies of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 59

30. Frequency of Evaluation of Departments and Programs 61

LIST OF TABLES

Page

31. Importance of Selected Factors in Department and Program Evaluations by Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers 63

32. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Factors in the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Assessment of Program Quality 64

33. The Relationship Between Size and the Importance of Publications in the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Assessment of Programs and Department Quality 66

34. Relationship Between the Importance of Publications in Department and Program Evaluations by Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers and the Rating of Full Professors' Salaries Relative to the National Average 68

35. Regression of the Importance of Publications in the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Assessment of Department and Program Quality on Selected Institutional Characteristics 69

36. Regression of the Importance of Teaching in the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Assessment of Department and Program Quality on Selected Institutional Characteristics 70

37. Intercorrelation Matrix of Factors Used by Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers in Assessing Department and Program Quality . . 72

38. Factor Analysis of Variables in the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Assessment of Department and Program Quality . 73

39. Administrators Having Signature Authority for Liberal Arts Grants 76

40. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Signature Authority for Grants 78

41. Grant Assistance Provided to Faculty by Staff Under the Supervision of the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer 80

42. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and the Provision of Technical Grant Assistance to Faculty by Staff Under the Supervision of the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer . 82

43. Availability of Institutional Funds for Selected Educational Activities and Purchases 84

44. Full Professors' Salaries, As Compared With the National Average . 86

LIST OF TABLES

Page

45. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Resources to Support Teaching and Research 87

46. Intercorrelation Matrix of Institutional Funding to Support Teaching and Research 89

47. Factor Analysis of the Availability of Institutional Funds to Support Teaching and Research 90

48. Factor Analysis of the Availability of Institutional Funds to Support Teaching and Research, Graduate-Level Factors Removed . 92

49. Faculty Teaching Load 94

50. Proportion of the Faculty's Time That is Devoted to Teaching 95

51. Proportion of Liberal Arts Courses Taught by Part-Time Instructors 96

52. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Variables Measuring Teaching Efforts 97

53. The Relationship Between Urbanization and the Proportion of Liberal Arts Courses Taught by Part-Time Instructors 99

54. The Relationship Between Faculty Size and Faculty Teaching Load 100

55. The Relationship Between Faculty Size and the Proportion of the Faculty's Time That is Devoted to Teaching 101

56. Regression of the Proportion of Faculty Effort Devoted to Teaching on Selected Institutional Characteristics and Conditions 102

57. Relationship Between the Importance of a National Reputation in Department and Program Evaluations by the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer and the Proportion of Faculty Time Devoted to Teaching 103

58. Relative Weights of Factors in Tenure Decisions 105

59. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and the Weighting of Factors in Tenure Decisions 106

LIST OF TABLES

Page

60. Relationship Between the Weighting of Research in Tenure Decisions and the Availability of Funds for Research by Untenured Professors 107

61. Relationship Between the Importance of a National Reputation the Dean's Evaluation of Departments and Program and the Weighting of Publications in Tenure Decisions 108

62. Relationship Between the Importance of Publications in Department and Program Evaluations by Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers and the Weighting of Publications in Tenure Decisions 109

63. Regression of the Weighting of Teaching in Tenure Decisions on Selected Institutional Characteristics and Conditions 111

64. Regression of the Weighting of Research in Tenure Decisions on Selected Institutional Characteristics and Conditions 112

65. Use of Merit Salary Increases to Encourage Excellence 114

66. Relationships Between Institutional Characterisitics and the Use of Merit Salary Increases to Reward Excellence in Teaching, Research, and Community Service 115

67. The Relationship Between Faculty Size and the Use of Merit Salary Increases for Teaching 116

68. The Relationship Between Faculty Size and the Use of Merit Salary Increases for Research 117

69. Regression of Merit Salary Increases for Teaching on Selected Institutional Characteristics and Conditions 118

70. Regression of Merit Salary Increases for Research on Selected Institutional Characteristics and Conditions 119

71. Factor Analysis of Variables in Tenure Decisions and the Use of Merit Salary Increases 120

72. Selected Relationships Among Evaluation Standards 122

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank Bill England, Tim Gustafson, Leslie Mosley, Diane Gift, Nancy Ritsko and Steven Holt for their help with data analysis. Donna Michalak and Trish Mauro were most helpful in producing this manuscript. Funds for this research were provided by the Institute for Advanced Research, which is a unit of the Graduate School at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

I

INTRODUCTION

To Reclaim a Legacy, a recent report from the National Endowment for the Humanities, reminds us all of the continuing centrality of the liberal arts in American higher education. This monograph contains data from a recent national study of liberal arts education conducted by the authors at IUP's Institute for Advanced Research. The study is unusual in the definition of its sampling frame as American chief liberal arts academic officers and in its subject matter as the careers, occupational experiences, and professional behavior of the liberal arts administrators and their reports about institutional resources and rewards used to support excellence in liberal arts teaching and liberal arts research.

Names of chief liberal arts academic officers were obtained from address labels of arts and sciences deans and chief college and university academic affairs officers provided by Peterson's Distribution Services, a program of Peterson's Guides. The labels were organized into a single list of chief liberal arts academic officers by choosing the most appropriate position in each institution according to job title and, when necessary, administrative structure. Institutions in which the liberal arts were minimally present were excluded from the sampling frame. A total of 1,476 chief liberal arts academic officers constituted the final sampling frame, out of which questionnaires were sent to a 50 percent random sample in spring 1984. By the cutoff date for inclusion in the study, 371 of the 738 chief liberal arts academic officers had returned usable questionnaires, for a return rate of slightly over 50 percent. Since some respondents did not complete every query on the questionnaire, the N's in the tables are generally less than 371. Missing data have, by convention, been excluded from all tables.

Data processing was carried out using accepted methods of data entry and data verification. Data analysis was accomplished using SPSS^x (SPSS Inc., SPSS^x User's Guide, 1983). All bivariate correlations reported in the study are Tau b, a correlational measure for ordinal data, because many of the variables are ordinal in nature. The comparison of correlations among ordinal and interval or ratio-level variables is facilitated when all correlations are computed using the same formula. Relationships mentioned in the text of this report may be presumed to be statistically significant at the .001 level unless included in a table or specifically identified as being statistically significant at a lower level. Factor analysis and stepwise multiple regression using listwise deletion for incomplete case data were calculated where multivariate analysis seemed to have heuristic benefits to readers. Since the ordinal level of some of the variables violates one of the technical assumptions of the procedures, these multivariate results should be taken as no more than general indications of the multi-dimensional relationships inherent in any social survey data set in the field of higher education.

This monograph is not intended to be read from cover to cover. It is a data book consisting of 72 tables plus brief commentary on each of them. A few of the more obvious conclusions have been brought out of the data, but most analytic material has been reserved for the journal articles that will be produced in the next stage of the project. We hope the data contained in the following chapters will prove useful to liberal arts administrators in writing reports, policies, external grant proposals, and internal requests for funding.

Description of the Sample

Sixty-three (17 percent) of the sampled institutions offer doctorates, 163 (44 percent) offer master's and bachelor's degrees, and 145 (39 percent) are undergraduate institutions. Twenty-five percent of the institutions are church-related, 41 percent are independent private institutions, and 34 percent are public colleges and universities. The rural-urban geographical distribution of the institutions is fairly balanced, with 15 percent located in rural environments, 30 percent in small towns, 31 percent in urban environments, and 25 percent in metropolitan areas (standard rounding procedures sometimes produce percentages that do not sum 100).

A number of the institutional characteristics included in the sample are measures of the size of the organization. Sixty-six percent of the institutions employ fewer than 150 full-time equivalent faculty members, 21 percent employ 150-499 FTE faculty, 8 percent employ 500-1,000 FTE faculty, and 4 percent employ more than 1,000 FTE faculty. There are no graduate students at 40 percent of the institutions sampled (one offers master's degrees but did not have any graduate students enrolled at the time of the survey). Table 1 summarizes the student body size distribution for the institutions in the study. More than a quarter enroll 1,000 or fewer students and over a third have between 1,001 and 2,500 students. Large institutions are much fewer in number, 29 having 10,001 to 20,000 students and 17 enrolling in excess of 20,000 students.

These six basic institutional characteristics are intercorrelated at the .001 level of statistical significance in every case but one (rural/urban setting by private/public sponsorship). Public institutions are more likely than private institutions to offer master's degrees and

Table 1

Student Body Size

Size	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
1000 or fewer	101	27.2%
1001 - 2500	132	35.6%
2501 - 10000	92	24.8%
10001 - 20000	29	7.8%
More than 20000	17	4.6%
Total	371	100.0%

doctorates, and to have large numbers of faculty, graduate students, and total students. Urban institutions are differentiated from rural institutions in the same way that public institutions are from private institutions. Finally, master's and doctoral degrees are concentrated in the larger institutions.

Another way of looking at the data is to focus on the liberal arts administrative unit rather than the institution as a whole. These are the administrative mechanisms through which liberal arts educational services are delivered to students. In the small liberal arts college, the liberal arts unit usually comprises the entire college. The comprehensive university, by comparison, contains a number of colleges and schools, of which but one is typically the administrative home of the liberal arts. Department chairs in the larger universities may be considered to be administrators and have more than half of their time formally dedicated for administrative purposes. At the other end of the continuum, chairs of small departments in liberal arts colleges have few real administrative duties and receive no "release time" to compensate them for their departmental responsibilities. Table 2 shows the total number of FTE administrators responsible for the liberal arts in their institutions. The average institution in the sample had approximately ten FTE administrators with liberal arts responsibilities providing leadership to just under 100 faculty and staff (Table 3) who taught slightly more than 1,500 students (Table 4).

These averages are misleading, for the ratios of administrators, faculty and staff, and students are subject to substantial variation across the universe of American higher education. The Tau b correlation

Table 2

Number of FTE Administrators Responsible for the Liberal Arts

Number	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
1 - 2	31	9.3%
3 - 5	65	19.5%
6 - 8	54	16.2%
9 - 11	32	9.6%
12 - 15	37	11.1%
16 - 20	29	8.7%
21 - 30	31	9.3%
31 - 40	23	6.9%
More than 40	31	9.3%
Total	333	99.9%[a]

[a] Percentages do not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

Table 3

FTE Faculty and Staff in the Liberal Arts Unit

FTE Faculty and Staff	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
25 or fewer	28	8.2%
26 - 50	49	14.4%
51 - 75	64	18.8%
76 - 100	43	12.6%
101 - 150	70	20.5%
151 - 250	40	11.7%
251 - 500	28	8.2%
More than 500	19	5.6%
Total	341	100.0%

Table 4

FTE Students Served by the Liberal Arts Unit

FTE Students	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Less than 500	46	13.6%
500 - 749	32	9.4%
750 - 999	29	8.6%
1000 - 1499	58	17.1%
1500 - 1999	47	13.9%
2000 - 2999	39	11.5%
3000 - 3999	27	8.0%
4000 - 5999	26	7.7%
6000 - 9999	19	5.6%
10000 or more	16	4.7%
Total	339	100.1%[a]

[a] Percentages do not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

between full-time equivalent administrators and FTE faculty and staff in the institutions sampled was only .15. Other correlations were administrators by students, .14, and faculty and staff by students, .57. It is evident that the number of administrators is only loosely linked to the size of the faculty they supervise and the number of students they serve. FTE clericals, on the other hand, are more closely linked to FTE administrators (.46) than to FTE faculty (.34) or FTE students (.18) in the liberal arts academic unit.

This study is unusual in that it takes the liberal arts unit as its focus rather than a more traditional organizational focus such as liberal arts colleges or a specific group of liberal arts disciplines. Respondents in the study are not characterized by any particular title, but rather by their administrative responsibility for the liberal arts at their institutions. In making this choice, we abandoned an easily identifiable organizational framework in favor of a conceptual restructuring of traditional approaches to research in higher education. This allowed for the inclusion of noncomparable organizational forms in the same sample on the basis of similarity of function, the essential function being liberal arts educational service delivery. Readers will have to judge for themselves whether this research strategy has been successful.

II

CAREERS OF CHIEF LIBERAL ARTS ACADEMIC OFFICERS

Chief liberal arts academic officers have come up through the ranks. Unlike college presidents, they are rarely recruited from outside of the higher education community. There was not a single chief liberal arts academic officer in the sample who reported fewer than three years of experience in higher education (Table 5). The median length of higher education experience was close to 20 years, and a small proportion (12 percent) of the chief liberal arts academic officers had been in higher education for more than 30 years. The median number of years of service at the current institution was close close to 11 years, while the median tenure as chief liberal arts academic officer was a bit under five years. By and large, chief liberal arts academic officers have had extensive experience in higher education.

Fifty-six of the chief liberal arts academic officers were in their first year at their posts, 21 of whom were also new at the institution. This means that most of the promotions were internal rather than the product of external recruitment. If the proportion of respondents reporting no more than one year on the job were consistent over an extended period of time, we could assume a turnover rate of approximately seven years, rather than the five year median tenure of the chief liberal arts academic officers. Neither figure represents excessively high turnover for a position with responsibilities of this nature in the field of higher education.

The chief liberal arts academic officers held many different titles, with relatively little consistency from one institution to another. Forty-six distinct titles were reported by the respondents. It was

Table 5

Chronological Career Development of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers[a]

Number of Years	Years in Higher Education		Years at Current Institutions		Years in Current Position	
	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion
0 - 2	0	0.0%	35	9.7%	90	26.5%
3 - 5	6	1.6%	73	20.[illegible]%	116	34.1%
6 - 8	8	2.2%	55	15.2%	61	17.9%
9 - 11	17	4.6%	31	8.6%	27	7.9%
12 - 15	66	17.8%	49	13.5%	29	8.5%
16 - 20	108	29.2%	58	16.0%	11	3.2%
21 - 25	76	20.5%	22	6.1%	6	1.8%
26 - 30	45	12.2%	23	6.4%	0	0.0%
31 - 35	29	7.8%	10	2.8%	0	0.0%
36 - 40	10	2.7%	3	0.8%	0	0.0%
41 - 50	5	1.4%	3	0.8%	0	0.0%
Total	370	100.0%	362	100.1%	340	99.9%

[a] Column percentages may not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

possible to classify almost all of these 46 titles into three generic groups of job titles: liberal arts dean, arts and sciences dean, and academic vice-president. Forty-three percent of the chief liberal arts academic officers were liberal arts deans, 14 percent were arts and sciences deans, and 40 percent were vice-presidents (including provosts).

The most common doctoral degree discipline of the chief liberal arts academic officer was in the physical sciences or mathematics (Table 6). Education was the second most common doctoral degree area. Only after that did the traditional humanities of English (as well as other languages) and history appear. Four out of every five chief liberal arts academic officers received their doctoral degrees in a liberal arts discipline, but less than half of their doctorates were in the traditional humanities and fine arts. Many of these disciplines were poorly represented among chief liberal arts academic officers. For example, 13 of the respondents received doctorates in philosophy, religion, or theology, one reported a doctorate in medieval studies, four in linguistics, six in music, three in rhetoric, two in American studies, and none in art or art history.

The earliest doctoral degree received by a chief liberal arts academic officer was in 1940; the most recent was in 1984. Eighteen percent of the doctorates were granted between 1940 and 1960, 22 percent between 1961 and 1965, 30 percent between 1966 and 1970, and the remaining 30 percent since 1970. The median year for doctoral degree receipt was 1968. When compared with the respondents' length of service in higher education, this implies that a great many of the chief liberal arts academic officers did not receive their doctorates until they had been teaching for a number of years.

Table 6

Doctoral Degree Disciplines of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Discipline	Number of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers	Proportion of the Sample
Physical sciences, mathematics	76	22.7%
Education	60	17.9%
English, languages	55	16.4%
History	51	15.2%
Social sciences	41	12.2%
Other humanities	35	10.4%
Psychological sciences	14	4.2%
Business	4	1.2%
Total	335	100.2%[a]

[a] Percentages do not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

Career Success of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Respondents were asked to rate their careers and their feelings about their current institutions. Table 7 presents data on the first of these variables, self-defined salary success. More than one out of every five chief liberal arts academic officers defined his or her current salary as indicating a fairly or very low level of salary success relative to academics of the same age and qualifications. Most thought they were fairly successful in salary terms. The reports for self-defined career success (reflecting position and status in higher education rather than financial remuneration) were slightly more positive. Table 8 shows that 29 percent of the chief liberal arts academic officers believed their careers to be very successful, 56 percent fairly successful, 4 percent fairly unsuccessful, and 12 percent very unsuccessful.

The next table displays the chief liberal arts academic officers' assessment of their impact on the quality of education at their institutions. None of the administrators judged that impact to be zero, but just over one in five felt they were able to have an impact on education at the institution to only a limited degree. Factors such as budget limitations and competition from other administrators within the institution may function to limit the effects of the efforts made on behalf of the liberal arts by these chief liberal arts academic officers. Slightly more than a third of the chief liberal arts academic officers reported that they had very much of an impact on the quality of education in their own academic settings.

Comparing institutional impact with the chief liberal arts academic officers' feelings about their institutions (Table 10), we can see what

Table 7

Self-Defined Salary Success of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Salary Success	Number of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers	Proportion of the Sample
Very unsuccessful	28	7.8%
Fairly unsuccessful	49	13.7%
Fairly successful	215	60.1%
Very successful	66	18.4%
Total	358	100.0%

Table 8

Self-Defined Career Success of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Career Success	Number of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers	Proportion of the Sample
Very unsuccessful	44	12.0%
Fairly unsuccessful	14	3.8%
Fairly successful	203	55.5%
Very successful	105	28.7%
Total	366	100.0%

Table 9

Impact of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers on Educational Quality

Impact	Number of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers	Proportion of the Sample
Not at all	0	0.0%
To a limited degree	75	20.5%
Fairly much	163	44.5%
Very much	128	35.0%
Total	366	100.0%

Table 10

Feelings of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers About Their Institutions

Feelings	Number of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers	Proportion of the Sample
Not a good place for me	9	2.4%
A fairly good place for me	71	19.3%
A very good place for me	215	58.4%
A nearly perfect place for me	73	19.8%
Total	368	99.9%[a]

[a] Percentages do not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

appears to be a close correspondence between impact and feelings. This was confirmed by crosstabulating the two variables, which produced a correlation of .32. Administrators who feel they have no more than a limited impact on higher education at their instutions are likely to believe that the organization is a fairly good place for them rather than a very good or a perfect situation for them personally. At the other end of the continuum, the fact that more than three-quarters of the administrators defined their institutions as very good or perfect places for them is a positive commentary on liberal arts administration in America.

Despite relatively high opinions of their present situations, 69 percent of the respondents thought they would probably leave the position of chief liberal arts academic officer at some time in the future, mostly to return to teaching and research (31 percent), or to advance to another administrative position in higher education (43 percent). Many of the remaining respondents hoped to combine teaching, research, and administration in some future position, perhaps with an emphasis on consulting. Only a handful predicted that they would eventually move into private industry. The less positive an administrator's feelings about the institution, the more likely he or she was to expect to move to another position (Tau b = -.24).

Table 11 summarizes the distribution of career success, salary success, feelings about the institution, impact on education, and likelihood of resigning across six basic institutional characteristics. Career success, feelings about the institution, and the likelihood of resigning hardly vary at all by institutional type. Salary success and impact on education are signficantly related to every variable except the

Table 11

Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Careers of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers[a]

Career StudentVariables Body	Highest Degree	Private/ Public Offered	Rural/ Urban	Faculty Size	Total Student	Graduate Body
	Institutional Characteristics					
Career success	.09*	.05	-.01	.07	.06	.11*
Salary success	.21***	.13**	.03	.21***	.21***	.20***
Feelings about the institution	-.02	-.08	.02	-.02	-.02	-.04
Impact on education	-.09*	-.11**	-.06	-.12**	-.19***	-.13**
Likely to resign	.02	.04	.00	.00	.03	.01

[a] All correlations are Tau b.

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

***Statistically significant at less than .001.

urbanization of the institution's geographical setting. It is surprising to see that relationships with salary success are always in the opposite direction from relationships with educational impact. High salary success is most likely to be found in large public institutions offering doctorates, while high educational impact is most likely to be found in small to medium-sized private, undergraduate institutions. In the total sample, the correlation between salary success and educational impact is exactly zero.

It is important to note that the chief liberal arts academic officer's feelings about the institution are at the same positive level in large universities and small colleges, in rural and urban settings, and in public as well as private institutions of higher education. Table 12 illustrates this conclusion with data about the institutional feelings of chief liberal arts academic officers in private church-related, private independent, and public colleges and universities. The proportion of administrators reporting that the local institution is very good or nearly perfect for them varied only from 74 percent at public institutions to 81 percent at private independent institutions, which is too small a difference to be statistically (or substantively) significant in a sample of less than 400 respondents.

Table 13 illustrates the most important single influence on the chief liberal arts academic officer's feelings toward the institution. The higher the proportion of departments and programs that are outstanding, the more likely chief liberal arts academic officers are to feel that the institution is very good or nearly perfect for them. Unfortunately, the interpretation of this relationship is not as simple as it appears. The department and program ratings are not objective. They represent the subjective (although certainly professional) judgments

Table 12

Relationship Between Institutional Sponsorship and the Chief Liberal Arts Officer's Feelings About the Institution

	Institutional Sponsorship		
Feelings About the Institution	Private Church Related	Private Independent	Public
Not good or fairly good	19.6%	18.8%	25.6%
Very good	63.0%	53.0%	62.4%
Nearly perfect	17.4%	28.2%	12.0%
N	92	149	125

Tau b = -.08, not statistically significant.

Table 13

Relationship Between the Proportion of Departments and Programs That Are Outstanding and the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Feelings About the Institution

	Proportion of Departments and Programs That Are Outstanding[a]			
Feelings About the Institution	Less than 20%	20-29%	30-39%	40% or More
Not good, fairly good	32.2%	17.6%	9.5%	16.4%
Very good	55.9%	64.8%	69.0%	38.2%
Nearly perfect	11.9%	17.6%	21.4%	45.5%
N	143	108	42	55

Tau b = .24, statistically significant at less than .001.

[a] Column percentages may not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

of the respondents, so they could be the partial product of a halo effect in which both the institution and its programs are seen more positively by some respondents than they are by others. Another way to conceptualize the halo effect would be to say that administrators who have positive feelings about the institution tend to be influenced by those positive feelings when it comes to assessing department and program quality. Were this to be true (and it very well might be), then the causal sequencing implied in the initial sentence of this paragraph would be reversed or nullified.

Factors related to the chief liberal arts academic officer's feelings about the institution are explored further in Table 14, wherein the institutional feelings variable is regressed on the four variables with which it was found to be most highly correlated. The proportion of the departments and programs judged to be outstanding was the most important predictor variable in the regression, followed by the relative salary level of full professors, the chief liberal arts academic officer's years in the position and the financial sponsorship of the institution. The four variables produced a multiple correlation of .40 with the chief liberal arts academic officer's feelings about the institution.

Table 15 provides details on another one of the correlations from Table 11, the relationship between student body size and the chief liberal arts academic officer's impact on the institution's educational quality. There is a linear decrease in the proportion of respondents reporting that they have very much of an impact on educational quality from institutions with student bodies size 1,000 or smaller (50 percent) to institutions that enroll over 10,000 students (18 percent). The

Table 14

Regression of the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Feelings About the Institution on Selected Institutional Characteristics and Conditions

Independent Variables	Multiple Correlation	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta Weight	T
Proportion of departments and programs that are outstanding	.28	.155	.030	.257	5.096***
Full professors' salary	.36	.145	.032	.236	4.556***
Years in the role	.38	.066	.029	.116	2.296*
Private/public	.40	-.096	.043	-.113	-2.214*
Constant		1.285	.148		8.705***

N = 345

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

***Statistically significant at less than .001.

Table 15

Relationship Between Student Body Size and the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Impact on Educational Quality

	Size of Student Body[a]			
Extent of Impact	1,000 or Fewer	1,001-2,500	2,501-10,000	Over 10,000
Limited degree	12.0%	19.2%	29.3%	25.0%
Fairly much	38.0%	47.7%	41.3%	56.8%
Very much	50.0%	33.1%	29.3%	18.2%
N	100	130	92	44

Tau b = -.19, statistically significant at less than .001.

[a] Columns may not sum 100.0% due to standard ranking procedures.

proportion of respondents reporting only a limited impact on educational quality rises unevenly from 12 percent in the smallest institutions to 29 percent in institutions enrolling 2,501 to 10,000 students and then drops to 25 percent in the largest colleges and universities.

The final table in this chapter is also based on Table 11. The regression summarized in Table 16 was performed in order to reveal the major factors associated with the salary success of chief liberal arts academic officers. To the four highest correlations between institutional characteristics and salary success were added two other variables having relatively strong bivariate correlations with salary success, the importance of a national reputation in the chief liberal arts officer's assessment of department and program quality, and the number of full-time equivalent students served by the liberal arts academic unit. Only two of the six variables met the minimum criteria for inclusion in the regression, limiting the predictive value of the exercise. Highest degree offered and student body size, acting together on salary success, produced a multiple correlation of .27, which is quite low compared with the multiple correlations typically produced in survey research.

Table 16

Regression of the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Self-Defined Salary Success on Selected Institutional Characteristics and Conditions

Independent Variables	Multiple Correlations	Unstandardized Regression Coefficients	Standard Error	Beta Weight	T
Highest degree offered	.23	.172	.066	.155	2.613**
Student body size	.27	.111	.043	.155	2.612**
Constant		2.354	.117		20.041***

N = 342

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

***Statistically significant at less than .001.

Variables failing to meet the minimum criteria for inclusion in the equation:
- Faculty size
- Graduate student body size
- Importance of a national reputation in the chief liberal arts academic officer's assessment of department and program quality
- FTE students served by the liberal arts academic unit

III

ADMINISTRATIVE CONDITIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR OF CHIEF LIBERAL ARTS ACADEMIC OFFICERS

Most (61 percent) chief liberal arts academic officers serve in their administrative posts at the pleasure of the president or another administrator beyond their own level, 27 percent receive "automatic" annual contracts, and 8 percent receive contracts for a specific number of years (the most common interval being five years). This limited job security in an administrative role is supplemented by tenured faculty backup positions for the majority (57 percent) of the chief liberal arts academic officers.

A very high percentage of chief liberal arts academic officers receive advice on matters of academic policy and curriculum from faculty committees (Table 17). Nearly half of them receive advice on research support for faculty members, and exactly half of the chief liberal arts academic officers in graduate institutions (30 percent of all chief liberal arts academic officers) have a faculty committee that advises them on issues related to graduate student welfare. The advice they receive from these committees is not taken lightly. Only six administrators followed the advice of their faculty advisory committees less than half the time, and the median acceptance of faculty committee advice was close to 90 percent (Table 18). One in every eight chief liberal arts academic officers almost always followed all of the advice received from faculty committees. When asked to make a qualitative instead of a quantitative judgment about relations with faculty advisory

Table 17

Prevalence of Faculty Advisory Committees to the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer

Advisory Committees	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Policy	328	88.4%
Curriculum	365	98.4%
Research support	171	46.1%
Graduate student welfare	113	30.5%
Other advisory committees	61	16.4%

Table 18

Frequency With Which Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers Follow the Advice of Faculty Advisory Committees

Frequency	Number of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers	Porportion of Sample
Less than 50% of the time	6	1.7%
51-80% of the time	85	23.5%
81-90% of the time	120	33.2%
91-95% of the time	103	28.5%
96-100% of the time	47	13.0%
Total	361	99.9%[a]

[a] Percentages do not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

committees, six-sevenths of the chief liberal arts academic officers indicated that faculty advisory committees were either influential (48 percent) or very influential (38 percent) on the general direction of policy in the liberal arts academic unit (see Table 19).

Length of appointment varies only slightly by type of institution, but tenured backup positions are much more common in large than small institutions (Tau b = .34 with student body size), in public institutions (Tau b = .32), and in institutions offering graduate degrees (Tau b = .31). No differences were found by type of institution for the presence of faculty advisory committees on academic policy and curriculum, the extent to which faculty advice was followed, or the influence of faculty committees on the general direction of policy in the liberal arts academic unit. Advice on research support and graduate student welfare was naturally more likely to be received from faculty committees in large institutions offering graduate programs than in other institutions. The effect of institutional sponsorship was greater on the presence of advice from a faculty committee on research support (Tau b = .25, public higher than private) than on advice about graduate student welfare (Tau b = .10, statistically significant at less than .05).

Administrative Behavior of the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer

Chief liberal arts academic officers are so busy with their administrative responsibilities that it is difficult for them to find time for teaching. We see in Table 20 that most of them teach either one or two courses per year, a few teach more than one course per semester, and more than a third of these liberal arts administrators never teach at all. One set of burdens which is usually avoided by chief liberal arts academic administrators consists of responsibilities for admission to the

Table 19

Influence of Faculty Advisory Committees on Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Degree of Influence	Number of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers	Proportion of the Sample
Not influential	3	0.8%
Somewhat influential	48	13.0%
Influential	178	48.4%
Very influential	139	37.8%
Total	368	100.0%

Table 20

Teaching Responsibilities of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Semester Hours Taught Annually	Number of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers	Proportion of the Sample
None	133	36.0%
One-three	105	28.5%
Four-six	100	27.1%
More than six	31	8.4%
Total	369	100.0%

liberal arts unit, awarding financial aid, and certifying degree completion. Table 21 shows that these functions are most likely to be controlled by campus-wide offices and least likely to be controlled by the chief liberal arts academic officer. The academic departments fall between the two extremes in every case except the admission of graduate students, where they are slightly more likely than campus-wide offices to be the focus of control for decision-making. Avoiding these responsibilities is a mixed blessing, since this also means that chief liberal arts academic officers lose some degree of control over academic standards in their units. One area over which chief liberal arts academic officers generally have control is the formulation of due process policies for student grievances. Sixty-seven percent of the respondents reported that they are responsible for student grievance policies.

What do chief liberal arts academic officers do with their professional time? Table 22 contains the mean estimates of actual and ideal time usage by these administrators, along with the ranked positions of the 17 activities from most to least time-consuming. Because extreme values have a disproportionately large statistical effect on the calculation of means, the high proportion of time devoted by a small number of chief liberal arts officers to nearly every activity examined has inflated the mean percentage of time for that activity in the total sample. It is for this reason that the total of the mean proportions of time used for the 17 activities comes to more than 100 percent. Chief liberal arts academic officers spend more of their professional time in conferences with faculty and other administrators, formal committee meetings, and personnel matters than in any other activities.

Table 21

Administrative Control of Student Processing and Financial Aid Decisions

Administrative Actions	Locus of Control[a]		
	Academic Department	Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer	Campus-Wide Office
Admitting undergraduate students	11.1%	9.7%	86.0%
Admitting graduate students	34.5%	5.9%	30.5%
Awarding undergraduate financial aid	5.7%	2.7%	89.8%
Awarding graduate financial aid	15.6%	9.2%	46.4%
Certifying undergraduate degrees	29.4%	27.0%	54.2%
Certifying graduate degrees	25.6%	11.3%	35.0%

[a] Categories are not mutually exclusive, so row, percentages do not sum 100.0.

Table 22

Relationship Between Actual and Ideal Time Usage by Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Activity	Actual Time Usage		Ideal Time Usage	
	Mean Proportion	Rank	Mean Proportion	Rank
Conferences with administrators	13%	3	11%	3.5
Conferences with faculty	13%	3	14%	1.5
Formal committee meetings	14%	1	10%	6
Teaching	7%	10	8%	8.5
Personal Research	2%	16	7%	10.5
Representing unit to external community	5%	11	6%	12.5
Professional travel	4%	12.5	5%	14
Preparing reports	8%	8	6%	12.5
Consulting	3%	14.5	4%	15.5
Professional reading	4%	12.5	7%	10.5
Personnel matters	12%	5	10%	6
Budget	9%	6	8%	8.5
Curriculum development	8%	8	11%	3.5
Support of internally funded research	1%	17	2%	17
Support of grant acquisition	3%	14.5	4%	15.5
Policy development	8%	8	10%	6
Other	13%	3	14%	1.5

Spearman's rho = .73

The rank-order correlation between actual and ideal time usage by chief liberal arts academic officers is .73, which indicates a substantial correspondence between what the respondents do in their daily routine and what they believe they should be doing in their professional lives. The largest discrepancies between ideal and actual time usage were for personal research, professional reading, curriculum development, and formal committee meetings. Chief liberal arts academic officers felt they did not have enough time for the first three activities, and that formal committee meetings took up too much of their time. Although the largest discrepancy, for personal research, is only 5 percent, it means that chief liberal arts academic officers devote less than a third of the time to personal research that they judge to be proper for someone in their administrative position, roughly one hour instead of three hours per week.

The respondents cited formal committee meetings as taking 40 percent more of their time than they would like to devote to committee work. Table 23 examines their committee participation in greater detail. Chief liberal arts academic officers are most likely to serve on the budget committee (67 percent), the computer resources committee (45 percent), the major equipment committee (36 percent), and the library committee (34 percent). It is not common for them to routinely chair any of these committees. The category of other major committees in Table 23 consists mainly of curriculum committees, councils of deans, academic standards committees, and academic affairs committees.

There is a dilemma in these data. Chief liberal arts academic officers feel they spend too much time in committee meetings, yet they

Table 23

Major Committee Memberships of the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer

Major Committees	Member Only		Member and Chair		Total Representation	
	Number of Institutions	Proportion	Number of Institutions	Proportion	Number of Institutions	Proportion
Budget	223	60.1%	26	7.0%	249	67.1%
Library	114	30.7%	13	3.5%	127	34.2%
Major equipment	107	28.8%	26	7.0%	133	35.8%
Graduate council	71	19.1%	31	8.4%	102	27.5%
Computer resources	139	37.5%	29	7.8%	168	45.3%
Research facilities	56	15.1%	17	4.6%	73	19.7%
Other major committees	72	19.4%	73	19.7%	145	39.1%
Human subject protection	33	8.9%	4	1.1%	37	10.0%

are not well represented on most major committees. It is not unreasonable to argue that these administrators, as major advocates for excellence in higher education, should increase their presence on bodies such as the library committee, the graduate council, and the major equipment committee.

Chief liberal arts academic officers are better represented on major committees in some types of institutions than in others. They are more likely to be on most major committees in institutions that are relatively small, public, and offering either four-year or a combination of four-year and master's degrees. These effects are strongest for library committees and weakest for computer resources committees.

Evaluating Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Approximately a third of the chief liberal arts academic officers in the sample are never evaluated (Table 24). Less than half of them receive regular annual evaluations, and a small number are evaluated at intervals of two, three, or four years.

Evaluations generally proceed downward rather than upward. Fifty-eight percent of the chief liberal arts academic officers reported that they were evaluated by presidents or chancellors, and 22 percent indicated that they were evaluated by vice-presidents or provosts (Table 25). Faculty members became involved in the evaluations of less than a quarter of the chief liberal arts academic officers. Department chairs were even less likely to be consulted. The consumer approach to educational service delivery, now so common in the form of student course evaluations, has not yet reached the higher administrators in most of the institutions included in the study.

Table 24

Frequency of Formal Evaluations of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Frequency of Evaluations	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Never	121	32.9%
Every four years	36	9.8%
Every two-three years	41	11.1%
At least annually	170	46.2%
Total	368	100.0%

Table 25

Evaluators of the Administrative Performance of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers[a]

Evaluators	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Faculty	85	22.9%
Department Chairs	61	16.4%
Vice president, provost	81	21.8%
President, chancellor	214	57.7%
Other evaluators	40	10.8%

[a] Categories are not mutually exclusive.

Job Satisfactions and Job Frustrations of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Respondents were asked to identify their three main job satisfactions and job frustrations. These were then coded into the summary categories that are shown in Tables 26 and 27. The three most important job satisfactions of chief liberal arts academic officers in Table 26 are (1) working with faculty, staff, and administrators, (2) program development, and (3) personal factors. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents cited one of these three factors as the most satisfying aspect of their job. The order of the job satisfactions is unchanged from the list of the most satisfying single job aspect to the parallel list of the three most important job satisfactions. Examples of the responses that were coded into the summary categories of job satisfactions follow.

Working with Faculty, Staff, and Administrators

Personal support of colleagues.

Cordial relationships with my fellow administrators and most faculty members.

Working with faculty to improve teaching effectiveness.

Opportunity to reward individuals.

Contact with and service to faculty.

Seeing young faculty mature.

Table 26

Major Job Satisfactions of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Major Job Satisfactions	Mentioned As the Most Satisfying Job Aspect		Mentioned As One of the Three Most Satisfying Job Aspects	
	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion
Working with faculty, staff, and administrators	85	26.0%	210	64.2%
Program development	73	22.3%	176	53.8%
Personal factors	48	14.7%	156	47.7%
Working with students	37	11.3%	105	32.1%
Making decisions	35	10.7%	82	25.1%
Challenge	31	9.5%	60	18.3%
Administration	8	2.4%	51	15.6%
Response to community needs	4	1.2%	24	7.3%
Budget	0	0%	9	2.8%
Other satisfactions	6	1.8%	—	—
Total	327	99.9%[a]	—	—[b]

---

[a] Percentages do not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

[b] Percentages do not sum 100.0 because categories are not based on a single 100.0 percent breakdown.

Program Development

Curriculum modification and change.

Witness the success of the institution in generative growth.

Assisting departments in defining and achieving objectives.

Opportunity to direct the academic destiny of the institution.

Guiding the daily operation of a quality educational institution and planning for continuing excellence.

Personal Factors

An atmosphere of informality and relaxation.

Being in the environment.

Personal research into institutional improvement methods.

Friendships in the community which grew out of the job.

View from my window--which I seldom have time to see.

Seeing how the role is always honing me to be a better force of good.

The major job frustrations associated with leading the liberal arts academic community are detailed in Table 27. The three factors mentioned most often as the number one job frustration are (1) the budget, (2) time constraints, and an item that was listed as the most important job satisfaction, (3) working with faculty, staff, and administrators. The order is slightly different if we focus on the three most frustrating job aspects instead of the single most frustrating factor. Frustrations (1) and (2) change places, and "problems originating in the faculty" moves up into third place. Here are examples of the responses from all four categories.

Table 27

Major Job Frustrations of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Major Job Frustrations	Mentioned As the Most Frustrating Job Aspect		Mentioned As One of the Three Most Frustrating Job Aspects	
	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion
Budget	74	23.0%	165	51.2%
Time constraints	73	22.7%	178	55.3%
Working with faculty, staff, and administrators	48	14.9%	101	31.4%
Problems originating in the faculty	42	13.0%	115	35.7%
Making decisions	31	9.6%	67	20.8%
Administration	20	6.2%	71	22.0%
Personal factors	16	5.0%	53	16.4%
Working with students	6	1.9%	25	7.8%
Low perception of the value of liberal arts by others	4	1.2%	14	4.3%
Program development	1	0.3%	16	5.0%
Other	7	2.2%	--	--
Total	322	100.0%	--	--[a]

[a] Percentages do not sum 100.0 because categories are not based on a single 100.0 percent breakdown.

The Budget

Finding adequate funding.

Budgetary constraints.

Inadequate funding of academic programs.

Lack of resources.

Time Constraints

Routine paperwork.

Handling paperwork in areas where no responsibility has been assigned.

Not enough time for professional reading and research.

Interruptions.

Endless, and sometimes unproductive, administrative and faculty committee meetings.

Working with Faculty, Staff and Administrators

Dealing with personal problems of faculty and staff.

Terminating staff.

Unprofessional faculty and staff.

Personnel decisions.

Non-productive employees or peers.

Having to reconcile divergent views of faculty and administrators.

Problems Originating in the Faculty

Difficulty of faculty recruiting in some fields.

Faculty arrogance.

Incredible narrowness of the average faculty member.

Faculty turnover.

Retrenchment.

Reluctance on part of faculty to see change occur.

Incompetent faculty.

We-they attitude of faculty toward administration.

Stressful political process in the faculty.

IV

DEPARTMENT AND PROGRAM EVALUATION

The opinions chief liberal arts academic officers hold about many of the departments and programs under their supervision are strongly positive. Fifty-nine percent of the administrators judged one-fifth or more of their departments and programs to be outstanding and 71 percent felt that at least half of their departments and programs were good, although not outstanding. Less than a tenth of the chief liberal arts academic officers rated more than 10 percent of their departments and programs as inferior. The frequency distribution of judgments about outstanding departments is presented in Table 28.

Resources are not evenly allocated among these programs. Chief liberal arts academic officers, like other academic administrators, are much more likely to favor their strongest programs than to allocate resources to their weakest programs in an attempt to build them up. Table 29 shows how many chief liberal arts academic officers favor either the maintenance of programs that are already outstanding or the upgrading of good programs to the outstanding level. Only a small number of the administrators studied gave top priority to upgrading fair (10 percent) or inferior (6 percent) programs. It appears that the "star system" dominates the resource allocation patterns of the overwhelming majority of chief liberal arts academic officers. To paraphrase the title of a classic book on American poverty, the best get better and the worst get

Table 28

Proportion of Departments and Programs Judged to be Outstanding by Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Proportion Judged to be Outstanding	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
None	35	10.0%
1-19 percent	110	31.4%
20-39 percent	150	42.9%
40-59 percent	34	9.7%
60-79 percent	11	3.1%
80-100 percent	10	2.9%
Total	350	100.0%

Table 29

Resource Allocation Policies of Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Policies	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Upgrade inferior programs	20	5.8%
Upgrade fair programs	30	8.7%
Upgrade good programs	90	26.0%
Upgrade good programs and maintain outstanding programs	81	23.4%
Maintain outstanding programs	91	26.3%
Other policies	34	9.8%
Total	346	100.0%

worse. This policy, when followed over an extended period of time, leads to the peaks and valleys of quality in educational service delivery which characterize departments at so many colleges and universities today.

There was little variation found among the respondents in their judgments about the quality of the programs and departments in the liberal arts academic unit or in their policies for resource allocation to these programs and departments. Departments were slightly more likely to be judged as outstanding in undergraduate colleges than in universities, private institutions, institutions located outside of urban areas, and relatively small institutions. These correlations ranged from -.08 to -.15, all statistically significant, but only at the .05 or .01 level. The resource allocation policies of the chief liberal arts academic officers varied little by institutional type. The star system is typical of American colleges and universities regardless of their characteristics.

The average department or program in the study was evaluated once every five years (Table 30). Very few were never evaluated, and 82 (22 percent) were formally evaluated every year. Evaluations were most likely to be carried out by administrators (72 percent) and faculty (66 percent), followed by external evaluators (55 percent). These proportions do not sum 100 percent because the categories of evaluators are not mutually exclusive. More than one type of evaluator is usually involved in each evaluation exercise. Evaluations were carried out slightly more frequently in private institutions (Tau b = -.11, statistically significant at less than .01) and those with small enrollments (Tau b = -.09, statistically significant at less than .05 with total student enrollment). Evaluation by faculty and administrators

Table 30

Frequency of Evaluation of of Departments and Programs

Frequency of Evaluations	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Never	17	4.7%
More than seven years	15	4.1%
Five-seven years	147	40.3%
Two-four years	104	28.5%
Annual	82	22.5%
Total	365	100.1%[a]

[a] Percentages do not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

is found equally in all types of institutions, while the use of evaluators is somewhat more common in the larger public colleges and universities than in the smaller institutions studied.

Factors in Department and Program Assessments by Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Fourteen distinct dimensions of excellence were included in the study. The chief liberal arts officers' use of these factors in evaluating programs and departments under their control is summarized in Table 31. Adding together the columns for important and very important, we find the most important factors in the assessment of programs and departments by chief liberal arts academic officers to be teaching quality (100 percent), internal reputation (77 percent), the number and level of content of course offerings (66 percent), the student attrition rate (65 percent), and the size and quality of the accepted student applicant pool (61 percent). Research-related factors, which are often thought to be overemphasized in American colleges and universities, were reported to be far less important than teaching-related factors in department and program evaluations. Papers given at professional meetings were judged to be important or very important by 47 percent of the administrators, publications by 41 percent, and grants by 32 percent. In the eyes of most chief liberal arts academic officers, a department's reputation within the institution is more important than its national reputation.

Table 32 presents the Tau b correlations between the 14 evaluation factors and the basic set of six institutional characteristics used throughout this study. Some factors are strongly related to all the

Table 31

Importance of Selected Factors in Department and Program Evaluations by Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

Factor	Rating				
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important	Total[a]
Grants	29.2%	39.1%	25.4%	6.3%	100.0%
Publications	15.6%	43.4%	29.5%	11.5%	100.0%
Papers at prof. meetings	9.3%	43.6%	42.0%	5.2%	100.1%
Conferences given	13.1%	49.5%	34.4%	3.0%	100.0%
Enrollment	3.0%	21.3%	48.8%	27.0%	100.1%
Teaching quality	0.0%	0.3%	13.0%	86.7%	100.0%
Reputation-internal	3.0%	20.4%	44.1%	32.5%	100.0%
Reputation-national	19.3%	32.2%	31.4%	17.1%	100.0%
Student quality, size	10.9%	27.7%	41.4%	20.0%	100.0%
Attrition rate	7.4%	27.3%	44.6%	20.7%	100.0%
Number, level of courses	8.0%	25.6%	48.5%	17.9%	100.0%
Time requirements for degrees	35.8%	36.1%	23.9%	4.2%	100.0%
Fellowship awards	28.6%	34.3%	27.5%	9.6%	100.0%
Placement of graduates	4.2%	17.9%	51.3%	26.6%	100.0%

[a] Row percentages do not always sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

Table 32

Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Factors in the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Assessment of Program Quality[a]

Assessment Factors	Institutional Characteristics Highest Degree Offered	Private/ Public	Rural/ Urban	Faculty Size	Total Student Body	Graduate Student Body
Research grants	.43***	.34***	.09*	.47***	.47***	.43***
Publication rate	.43***	.29***	.16***	.51***	.47***	.41***
Papers given	.27***	.19***	.06	.34***	.33***	.25***
Conferences given	.08*	.06	-.03	.08	.12**	.08*
Enrollment	.01	-.14**	-.03	-.11**	-.12**	.01
Teaching quality	-.20***	-.16***	-.18***	-.27***	-.24***	-.25***
Internal reputation	-.07	-.13**	-.01	-.17***	-.11**	-.11**
National reputation	.14***	.07	.11**	.20***	.15***	.12**
Student applications	.02	-.11**	.00	-.09*	-.10*	.01
Student attrition	-.17***	-.18***	-.04	-.27***	-.22***	-.17***
Courses offered	-.07	-.10*	-.03	-.14**	-.10*	-.06
Time requirement	-.09*	-.09*	.01	-.08*	-.08	-.08*
Fellowship awards	.10*	.04	.08*	.07	.13**	.09*
Placement of graduates	.00	-.06	-.04	-.10*	-.01	-.01

[a] All correlations are Tau b.

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

***Statistically significant at less than .001.

institutional characteristics except urbanization, while others are significantly related to only one or two of the institutional characteristics. In general, evaluation factors related to scholarly productivity are more highly differentiated by institutional type than are factors related to teaching or reputation. Relationships between institutional characteristics and (1) research, (2) publication rate, and (3) papers given at professional meetings are all in the same direction. Chief liberal arts academic officers are likely to consider these factors to be important in institutions that are large, private, graduate, and urban. Statistical significance levels fall below .001 for only the urbanization variable. National reputation follows the same pattern, although with much lower correlations.

Teaching factors are less strongly correlated with institutional characteristics than are research factors, and the correlations are consistently in the opposite direction. Institutions in which the chief liberal arts academic officers attach particular importance to teaching variables in their assessment of programs and departments tend to be private, small, undergraduate, and rural.

Table 33 illustrates the strongest relationship in the matrix formed by the correlations between the chief liberal arts academic officer's assessment factors and institutional characteristics. Publications are very important in department and program evaluations by chief liberal arts academic officers in less than 1 percent of the institutions employing fewer than 150 faculty, as compared with 23 percent of the institutions employing 500 or more faculty. Heavy publishers are in great demand in the academic marketplace. Institutions desiring to recruit and retain these scholars are forced to pay higher than average

Table 33

The Relationship Between Faculty Size and the Importance of Publications in the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Assessment of Programs and Department Quality

	Faculty size[a]		
Importance of Publications	Less Than 150	150–499	500 or More
Not important	22.5%	2.5%	2.2%
Somewhat important	54.2%	27.8%	13.3%
Important	22.9%	46.8%	33.3%
Very important	0.4%	22.8%	51.1%
N	240	79	45

Tau b = .51, statistically significant at less than .001.

[a] Columns may not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

salaries. Table 34 provides details on the relationship between the importance of publications in department and program evaluations and the salaries of full professors. Nearly half of the institutions in which publications are very important offer full professors' salaries that are good or very good, and none of them pay their full professors very poor salaries. What a contrast there is with institutions in which publications are not important. Fully 60 percent of these institutions provide their full professors with salaries that are poor or very poor. One caution that readers should keep in mind is that this analysis is based on the chief liberal arts academic officers' ratings of salaries, not the objective salary figures that are reported in the annual survey conducted by the American Association of University Professors.

Tables 35 and 36 report regressions of the importance of publications and the importance of teaching in the chief liberal arts academic officer's program and department evaluations on selected institutional characteristics. Importance of publications is predicted by faculty size, highest degree offered, full professors' salary, and student body size, with a multiple correlation of .61. Public/private sponsorship, urbanization, and graduate student body size add nothing to the predictive strength of the regression. Although full professors' salaries have the highest bivariate correlation with the importance of publications, the salary variable is revealed to be less important than faculty size and highest degree offered when it is examined within the context of a multivariate methodology.

The regression performed on the importance of teaching used the same set of independent variables, except that the salary variable was omitted because its bivariate relationship with teaching importance is

Table 34

Relationship Between the Importance of Publications in Department and Program Evaluations by Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers and the Rating of Full Professors' Salaries Relative to the National Average

Full Professors' Salaries	Importance of Publications[a]			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Very poor	15.8%	7.0%	8.3%	0.0%
Poor	43.9%	29.9%	24.1%	19.5%
Average	24.6%	43.9%	34.3%	34.1%
Good	14.0%	16.6%	21.3%	22.0%
Very good	1.8%	2.5%	12.0%	24.4%
N	57	157	108	41

Tau b = .23, statistically significant at less than .001.

[a] Column percentages may not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

Table 35

Regression of the Importance of Publications in the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Assessment of Department and Program Quality on Selected Institutional Characteristics

Independent Variables	Multiple Correlation	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta Weight	T
Faculty size	.56	.344	.087	.274	3.957***
Highest degree offered	.59	.264	.070	.214	3.779***
Full professors' salaries	.61	.094	.037	.112	2.511*
Student body size	.61	.138	.065	.153	2.134*
Constant		.818	.131		6.268***

N = 358

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

*** Statistically significant at less than .001.

Variables failing to meet the minimum criteria for inclusion in the equation:
Private/public
Urbanization of setting
Graduate student body size

Table 36

Regression of the Importance of Teaching in the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Assessment of Department and Program Quality on Selected Institutional Characteristics

Independent Variables	Multiple Correlation	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta Weight	T
Faculty size	.30	-.134	.024	-.278	-5.487***
Urbanization	.33	-.045	.017	-.133	-2.628**
Constant		2.182	.055		39.946***

N = 363

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

*** Statistically significant at less than .001.

Variables failing to meet the minimum criteria for inclusion in
the equation: Highest degree offered
Private/public
Student body size
Graduate student body size

essentially zero. Faculty size and urbanization, both with negative betas, are the only two variables meeting the criteria for inclusion in the regression shown in Table 36. The multiple correlation plateaus at an unimpressive .33. These two regressions confirm our observation about the bivariate correlations, which is that the research/publication complex of professorial performance variables is more highly differentiated by type of institution than is the parallel group of measures that indexes teaching excellence.

In Table 37, we find an intercorrelation matrix of 14 factors used by chief liberal arts academic officers in their assessments of program and department quality. Nearly all of the relationships are statistically significant, most of them at the .001 level. Very few of the correlations are negative, which suggests that chief liberal arts academic officers who pay a great deal of attention to one evaluation factor will also emphasize other factors in their evaluations of the departments and programs under their control. The only negative correlations reaching the .001 level of statistical significance are between teaching quality and both research grants (-.16) and publications (-.19). The highest positive correlations are all in the research/publication complex of professorial performance variables: research grants by publications (.64), publications by papers given at professional meetings (.64), papers given by conferences and workshops given (.57), and research grants by papers given (.56).

These relationships are explored further in Table 38. After nine iterations, the varimax factor analysis procedure converged and produced a four-factor rotated matrix. Factor one confirms the presence of a

Table 37

Intercorrelation Matrix of Factors Used by Chief
Liberal Arts Academic Officers in Assessing Department and Program Quality[a]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Research grants	x													
2. Publication rate	.64***	x												
3. Papers given	.56***	.64***	x											
4. Conferences given	.34***	.34***	.57***	x										
5. Enrollment	-.05	-.06	-.01	.11**	x									
6. Teaching quality	-.16***	-.19***	-.03	.06	.03	x								
7. Internal reputation	-.07	-.07	-.04	.10*	.26***	.21***	x							
8. National reputation	.30***	.30***	.21***	.15***	.02	-.03	.28***	x						
9. Student applications	.07	.05	.13**	.21***	.36***	.09*	.25***	.26***	x					
10. Student attrition	-.12**	-.13**	-.01	.12**	.35***	.20***	.24***	.09*	.51***	x				
11. Courses offered	-.06	-.10*	-.01	.14**	.20***	.16***	.21***	.07	.33***	.40***	x			
12. Time requirements	.03	-.03	.02	.10*	.17***	.03	.22***	.22***	.35***	.42***	.37***	x		
13. Fellowship awards	.27***	.25***	.27***	.20***	-.05	.06	.15***	.32***	.25***	.21***	.18***	.25***	x	
14. Placement of graduates	.03	.03	.04	.11*	.16***	.21***	.24***	.11*	.32***	.37***	.24***	.24***	.36***	x

[a] All correlations are Tau b.

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

*** Statistically significant at less than .001.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 38

Factor Analysis[a] of Variables in the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer's Assessment of Department and Program Quality

Assessment Factors	Factors 1	2	3	4
Research grants	.76733	-.09565	.26733	-.16628
Publications	.79970	-.14328	.24047	-.20965
Papers given	.88890	-.01009	.04397	.04112
Conferences given	.74733	.24214	-.09135	.17898
Student enrollment	.05338	.76006	-.23032	-.14085
Teaching quality	-.08495	.05870	-.06759	.81459
Internal reputation	-.12967	.40368	.41185	.16914
National reputation	.26946	.12550	.74174	-.16568
Student applicants	.19234	.74572	.21128	.05513
Student attrition	-.07149	.74821	.09358	.31843
Course offerings	-.07941	.57903	.18170	.25207
Time requirements for degrees	-.07073	.54411	.42628	.02714
Fellowships	.31995	.05531	.67395	.32993
Placement	.03878	.32985	.30983	.56109

N = 315

[a] Rotated factor matrix

distinct research/publication complex in the evaluation standards of chief liberal arts academic officers. It has very high loadings on grants, publications, papers, and conferences/workshops, and relatively low loadings on everything else. Factor two has its highest loadings on enrollment, attrition, course offerings, time requirements for degrees, and applications. It represents a concern with the administrative aspects of teaching rather than the key variable of teaching quality in the classroom. The two evaluation factors with high loadings on factor three are national reputation and fellowships, both of which reflect a marked interest in being competitive in the national educational marketplace rather than a local or regional focus. Factor four contains the teaching quality variable plus student placement. We might think of it as the student-oriented aspect of factor two's more formal approach to teaching service delivery. Internal reputation is not strongly associated with any factor. It has modest loadings on factor two and factor three.

Some chief liberal arts academic officers will fit one of the four evaluation paradigms created by the factor analysis procedure. Others are mixed types. They combine elements from different evaluation paradigms to create their own unique style of department and program evaluation. Readers are reminded that it is not legitimate to apply any correlations obtained from large samples of administrators to the daily behavior of individual administrators.

V

GRANTS ADMINISTRATION

This brief chapter deals with grant support and administrative authority for grants. Since more than one signature is often required on grants, the categories in Table 39 are not mutually exclusive. The president's signature is required on liberal arts grant proposals in most institutions, while the chief liberal arts academic officer has signature authority in less than half the colleges and universities studied. This is another one of the administrative areas identified in the survey in which the chief liberal arts academic officer's control over important operations in the liberal arts unit is attentuated in a surprisingly large number of institutions. One positive aspect of the data on grant signature authority is that the chief liberal arts academic officer is more likely than the financial vice president or another dean (in practice almost always the graduate dean) to have administrative control over external grant proposals.

A related point is that chief liberal arts academic officers administer institutional research support funds within the liberal arts unit in just 52 percent of the institutions. Internal research funding for liberal arts professors is controlled outside of the liberal arts unit in nearly half the cases. We assume that this external control is usually exercised by the graduate dean or a faculty committee under the sponsorship of the graduate school, but there are no data with which to test this assumption because the questionnaire did not probe any further into the area of internal funding for the research support of liberal arts faculty.

Table 39

Administrators Having Signature Authority for Liberal Arts Grants[a]

Administrators	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
President	223	60.9%
Chief liberal arts academic officer	172	46.4%
Financial vice-president	102	27.5%
Academic vice-president (not self)	79	21.3%
Dean (not self)	41	11.1%
Other administrators	32	8.6%

[a] Categories are not mutually exclusive.

The variations in grant signature authority by institutional type are summarized in Table 40. Differences in the likelihood that the chief liberal arts academic officer will have signature authority over liberal arts grants are small, and variation in the signature authority of the financial vice president is smaller still. Presidents and other deans (almost always graduate deans) have opposite patterns. Presidents are most likely to control liberal arts grants directly in institutions that are small (especially with respect to faculty size), undergraduate, private, and rural. In contrast, signature authority for liberal arts grants by graduate deans is more common in large institutions under public sponsorship and located in urban areas.

Questionnaires present an oversimplified view of reality, even when they are used in complex multivariate analyses of social phenomena. The above discussion of grant authority is an example of this limitation in survey methodology. Signature authority is not the same as administrative control over grants. By tradition, some administrators automatically sign all the grants that come before them. Others sign them only upon the advice of an administrator (perhaps a financial officer or a dean) whose signature does not appear on the grant at all. Does it matter when presidents sign grants if they never do so without the verbal approval of the chief liberal arts academic officer? Questionnaires, as opposed to qualitative methods such as direct observation and in-depth interviewing, reveal the outlines of formal decision-making structures without considering nuances such as institutional tradition, personal trust, and interpersonal dominance.

A second aspect of this same point is that it is very difficult to capture complex decision-making processes in a questionnaire which is

Table 40

Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Signature Authority for Grants

Administrators with Signature Authority for Grants	Institutional Characteristics					
	Highest Degree	Private/ Public	Rural/ Urban	Faculty Size	Student Body	Graduate Student Body
Chief liberal arts academic officer	.05	$.11^{*}$	.00	$.12^{*}$	$.12^{**}$	.04
Dean (not self)	$.25^{***}$	$.20^{***}$	.11*	$.29^{***}$	$.28^{***}$	$.27^{***}$
Academic vice-president (not self)	$.10^{*}$	.07	.02	$.11^{*}$	$.19^{***}$	$.17^{***}$
Financial vice-president	.00	.06	-.01	.01	$.09^{*}$	.00
President	$-.25^{***}$	$-.14^{**}$	$-.12^{**}$	$-.40^{****}$	$-.31^{***}$	$-.26^{***}$
Other administrators	.05	$.09^{*}$	.04	$.13^{**}$	$.09^{*}$	.04

All correlations are Tau b.

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

***Statistically significant at less than .001.

inherently linear and unidimensional at the point at which subjects respond to items on the questionnaire form, as well as when the data are entered in the computer for processing. How do we capture data to accurately mirror grant decision-making processes which vary from a single person to committees of different compositions? The matter is made still more complicated because these decision-makers sometimes have formal authority, sometimes make recommendations to an administrator who has formal authority, and sometimes have informal authority because the administrator traditionally exercises no independent judgment. All of these complexities theoretically could be modelled in a questionnaire, just as incredibly complicated problems can eventually be reduced to an extensive series of binary codes for computer processing. However, to do so for each point of interest in a questionnaire would produce a document hundreds of pages long that chief liberal arts officers would never have time to fill out. The response rate would plunge to zero.

There is no solution to this dilemma, only the best compromise that is consistent with the research goals of the investigators. Grants administration is not a major part of liberal arts administration in most American colleges and universities. We therefore settled for a simple picture of formal decision-making responsibility in order to save space on the questionnaire for the investigation of other aspects of liberal arts administration in greater depth.

Table 41 portrays the prevalence of six categories of grant assistance provided to faculty members by staff under the supervision of the chief liberal arts academic officer. Some form of grant assistance was offered to faculty in all but 14 of the institutions surveyed. The most common form of assistance consisted of identifying funding sources. This was found in 85 percent of the institutions. Other forms of

Table 41

Grant Assistance Provided to Faculty by Staff Under the Supervision of the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer

Form of Assistance	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Identifying funding sources	313	85.1%
Typing proposals	280	76.1%
Developing budgets	236	64.1%
Contacting funding sources	211	57.3%
Writing boilerplate	136	37.0%
Other Assistance	22	5.9%
None at all	14	3.8%

assistance offered in the liberal arts units of more than half the organizations were typing proposals (76 percent), developing budgets (64 percent), and contacting funding sources (57 percent).

The correlations between institutional characteristics and grant assistance in Table 42 are generally statistically significant, though not always at the .001 level. Large, public, graduate institutions are consistently more likely than other colleges and universities to provide four of the six categories of grant assistance to faculty through the staff of the liberal arts unit. Typing services are less likely to be offered in the liberal arts units of these colleges and universities, probably because the larger, more research-oriented institutions tend to create centralized proposal typing facilities administered by the graduate dean or the vice president for research.

Table 42

Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and the Provision of Technical Grant Assistance to Faculty by Staff Under the Supervision of the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer

	Institutional Characteristics					
Technical Grant Assistance	Highest Degree	Private/ Public	Rural/ Urban	Faculty Size	Student Body	Graduate Student Body
Identifying funding sources	.15***	12**	.06	.15**	.19***	.17***
Contacting funding sources	.15**	.10*	.01	.13**	.16***	.15**
Writing boilerplate	.12*	.10*	-.02	.16***	.18***	.13**
Developing budgets	.22***	.28***	.01	.20***	.23***	.20***
Typing proposals	-.11*	-.13**	-.05	-.17***	-.06	-.12**
Other assistance	.00	.03	-.01	.03	.03	.02

All correlations are Tau b.

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

***Statistically significant at less than .001.

VI

RESOURCES IN SUPPORT OF EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AND RESEARCH

How well are liberal arts faculty supported in their teaching and research? Table 43 lists 14 activities and acquisitions that are crucial in the production of excellence in teaching and research. More than half the chief liberal arts academic officers rated the availability of funds to be good or excellent for just six of the 14 categories of support. Library books (67 percent good or excellent funding), graduate courses (65 percent), library journals (62 percent), computer purchases (60 percent), and sabbaticals for both knowledge acquisition (59 percent) and research (56 percent) were more likely than the other support categories to be adequately funded in liberal arts units. The support categories least likely to receive good or excellent funding were research graduate assistants (20 percent), travel to develop grants (24 percent), grant development personnel (28 percent), research by senior professors (28 percent), research by untenured professors (29 percent), and the purchase of research equipment (30 percent). The 20 percent figure for research graduate assistants is even lower than it appears because the chief liberal arts academic officers at undergraduate institutions did not respond to this question. Adequate funding for research graduate assistants existed at not many more than one out of every ten institutions in the total sample.

It is commonly said that teaching is underfunded in comparison with research at many American colleges and universities. Table 43 is not an objective assessment of the budget figures for teaching and research support (nor could a comparison of apples with oranges such as this one be definitive even if budget details were available). To the extent to

Table 43

Availability of Institutional Funds for Selected Educational Activities and Purchases

Activity or Purchase	Funds[a]				
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N
Travel to conferences	14.1%	43.4%	32.0%	10.6%	369
Travel to develop grants	45.5%	30.4%	20.5%	3.7%	352
Research by senior professors	34.6%	37.2%	23.2%	5.0%	341
Research by untenured professors	34.7%	36.4%	24.9%	4.0%	346
Purchase of computers	9.3%	30.3%	44.4%	16.0%	356
Purchase of research equipment	29.8%	39.8%	25.2%	5.2%	349
Purchase of library books	7.0%	25.7%	51.2%	16.0%	369
Purchase of library journals	8.7%	29.7%	49.0%	12.6%	357
Personnel for grant development	33.5%	38.9%	24.0%	3.6%	334
Offering graduate courses often	11.0%	23.7%	51.6%	13.7%	219
Graduate assistants - research	42.2%	37.3%	17.3%	3.2%	185
Graduate assistants - teaching	25.5%	31.4%	31.4%	11.7%	239
Sabbaticals for knowledge	19.6%	21.3%	35.2%	23.9%	352
Sabbaticals for research	24.6%	19.0%	31.0%	25.4%	232

[a] Row percentages do not always sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

which the chief liberal arts academic officers' adequacy ratings reflect the true availability of teaching and research support services in their institutions, we must conclude that teaching support is far more adequate than support for research and scholarship in these colleges and universities.

Table 44 presents data on full professors' salaries, as compared with the national average by the chief liberal arts academic officers. The distribution is in the approximate shape of a normal curve with a slight skew toward the negative side. Thirty-seven percent of the chief liberal arts academic officers judged full professors' salaries to be poor or very poor, an equal proportion judged them to be average, and 26 percent judged the full professors' salaries to be good or very good.

How are resources in support of teaching and research excellence distributed among American colleges and universities? The data in Table 45 show that some resources, such as funds for the purchase of library books and travel to conferences, are equally likely to be at least adequate in all types of institutions. Other resources, most notably full professors' salaries and support for research by both untenured and senior professors, are considerably more likely to be in adequate supply in some types of institutions than in others. This is not to say that these relationships apply to individual institutions. There may be no variation in the availability of a given resource by institutional type, and yet there may be significant differences among institutions within a specific category of institutions. The resources that vary most by institutional type are those that are associated with research and grants. These resources are all more likely to be adequately provided to faculty in large, graduate institutions than to their colleagues in small, undergraduate institutions. There is also a slight tendency for

Table 44

Full Professors' Salaries, As Compared With the National Average

Salary Rating	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Very poor	29	7.9%
Poor	106	28.8%
Average	136	37.0%
Good	68	18.5%
Very good	29	7.9%
Total	368	100.1%[a]

[a] Percentages do not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

Table 45

Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Resources to Support Teaching and Research[a]

Resources	Institutional Characteristics					
	Highest Degree Offered	Private/ Public	Rural/ Urban	Faculty Size	Total Student Body	Graduate Student Body
Travel to conferences	-.01	-.06	.03	.00	.02	-.03
Travel to develop grants	.18***	.06	.11*	.19***	.16***	.15**
Research by senior professors	.14**	.10*	.08*	.26***	.23***	.12**
Research by untenured profs.	.14**	.10*	.10*	.32***	.27***	.13**
Purchase of computers	-.02	-.03	.08*	.04	.07	-.02
Purchase of research equip.	.06	.02	.10*	.19***	.11**	.07
Purchase of library books	-.07	-.06	-.01	-.02	.00	-.06
Purchase of library journals	-.01	-.10*	.00	-.03	-.02	-.01
Personnel for grant development	.17***	.08*	.03	.19***	.18***	.15***
Offering graduate courses often enough	.24***	-.06	.05	.04	.03	.17**
Graduate assistants-research	.34***	.07	.05	.33***	.20**	.23***
Graduate assistants-teaching	.08	.03	.01	.11*	.03	.00
Sabbaticals for knowledge	.11**	.03	-.01	.11**	.14***	.11*
Sabbaticals for research	.11*	.00	.04	.16**	.17**	.12*
Full professors' salaries	.17***	.15***	.06	.27***	.28***	.19***

[a] All correlations are Tau b.

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

*** Statistically significant at less than .001.

institutions that provide at least adequate funding for research and grants to be under public sponsorship and located in urban areas.

The intercorrelation matrix found in Table 46 reveals an inconsistency with earlier findings about factors in the chief liberal arts academic officer's assessment of department and program quality. Evaluation standards favoring research and publications were inversely related to evaluation standards favoring teaching quality. In contrast, there is not a single statistically significant negative correlation in the entire resource availability intercorrelation matrix. Nearly all the positive correlations are statistically significant, most of them at the .001 level. They range as high as .86. Institutions that have funds to support excellence in research also are likely to allocate substantial funding for teaching support. Liberal arts teachers in strongly research-oriented institutions may find themselves in the strange position of receiving excellent support to develop their teaching skills and subject matter competencies while simultaneously receiving little recognition for their teaching achievements in department evaluations. Many of them would probably prefer to trade some of their resources for increased professional respect and appreciation of their performance as teachers.

When factor analysis was used to further analyze the resource intercorrelation matrix, six factors were identified after six iterations of the varimax process (Table 47). Factor one is strongly loaded on grant travel, research by senior and untenured professors, and full professors' salaries. It represents support for the research/publication complex of professional performance factors. Factor two, the library factor, has heavy loadings on the purchase of library books and library journals.

Table 46

Intercorrelation Matrix of Institutional Funding to Support Teaching and Research[a]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Travel to conferences	x														
2. Travel to develop grants	$.42^{***}$	x													
3. Research by senior profs.	$.33^{***}$	$.42^{***}$	x												
4. Research by untenured profs.	$.28^{***}$	$.38^{***}$	$.72^{***}$	x											
5. Purchase of computers	$.16^{***}$	$.19^{***}$	$.32^{***}$	$.27^{***}$	x										
6. Purchase of research equip.	$.32^{***}$	$.34^{***}$	$.42^{***}$	$.43^{***}$	$.39^{***}$	x									
7. Purchase of library books	$.28^{***}$	$.18^{***}$	$.19^{***}$	$.16^{***}$	$.14^{**}$	$.24^{***}$	x								
8. Purchase of library journals	$.22^{***}$	$.16^{***}$	$.20^{***}$	$.14^{**}$	$.13^{**}$	$.21^{***}$	$.72^{***}$	x							
9. Personnel for grant development	$.22^{***}$	$.33^{***}$	$.27^{***}$	$.26^{***}$	$.24^{***}$	$.29^{***}$	$.11^{*}$	$.10^{*}$	x						
10. Offering graduate courses often enough	.02	$.15^{***}$	$.13^{*}$	.10	.05	.08	.03	$.17^{**}$	$.11^{*}$	x					
11. Research graduate assistantships	.08	$.27^{***}$	$.27^{***}$	$.32^{***}$	.05	$.22^{***}$	-.01	.00	$.27^{***}$	$.34^{***}$	x				
12. Teaching graduate assistantships	$.22^{***}$	$.24^{***}$	$.27^{***}$	$.30^{***}$	$.15^{**}$	$.30^{***}$	$.15^{**}$	$.12^{*}$	$.22^{***}$	$.28^{***}$	$.48^{***}$	x			
13. Sabbaticals to improve knowledge	$.22^{***}$	$.17^{***}$	$.29^{***}$	$.29^{***}$	$.13^{**}$	$.22^{***}$	$.15^{***}$	$.18^{***}$	$.13^{**}$	$.10^{*}$	$.15^{**}$	$.36^{***}$	x		
14. Sabbaticals to do research	$.29^{***}$	$.20^{***}$	$.32^{***}$	$.38^{***}$	$.19^{***}$	$.29^{***}$	$.16^{**}$	$.18^{***}$	$.18^{***}$	.08	$.21^{**}$	$.21^{**}$	$.86^{***}$	x	
15. Salary for full professors	$.32^{***}$	$.30^{***}$	$.33^{***}$	$.35^{***}$	$.17^{***}$	$.34^{***}$	$.16^{***}$	$.17^{***}$	$.17^{***}$	$.11^{*}$	$.22^{***}$	$.21^{***}$	$.18^{***}$	$.19^{**}$	x

[a] All correlations are Tau b.

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

*** Statistically significant at less than .001.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 47

Factor Analysis[a] of the Availability of Institutional Funds to Support Teaching and Research

Activities and Purchases in Support of Teaching and Research	Factors					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Travel to conferences	.26323	.44439	.19677	−.07994	.05112	.54792
Travel to develop grants	.50393	.12153	.04087	.12058	.05302	.67373
Research by senior professors	.67633	.12465	.30835	.07203	.32985	.14409
Research by untenured professors	.74563	−.05309	.25713	.15081	.29705	.07220
Purchase of computers	.05299	−.07200	.09289	.01865	.90144	.15678
Purchase of research equipment	.31520	.32886	.13663	.24886	.67360	−.01415
Purchase of library books	.12893	.90524	.06646	.04839	−.00440	.03397
Purchase of library journals	.04362	.93603	.07534	.05036	.08563	.07022
Personnel for grant development	−.04765	−.04725	−.01693	.26089	.11835	.80835
Offering graduate courses often enough	−.12116	.18380	−.01687	.74695	.[illegible]6381	.16088
Research grad. assistants	.40509	−.16392	.17740	.70342	−.04232	.12476
Teaching grad. assistants	.21042	.03036	.13887	.82300	.05404	.06125
Sabbaticals to improve knowledge	.07539	.12323	.95515	.07332	.08257	.01812
Sabbaticals to do research	.12607	.05732	.94091	.14787	.11709	.06388
Full professors' salaries	.68874	.20991	−.11788	.10266	−.09139	.08103

N = 115

[a] Rotated factor matrix.

The two sabbatical award categories dominate factor three. Factor four is most heavily loaded on three graduate school resource categories: graduate courses, research assistants, and teaching assistants. Purchases of computers and research equipment have the heaviest loadings on factor five, a second research support factor. Finally, factor six has its heaviest loadings on personnel for grant development and travel to both conferences and grant agencies. This is the last of the three factors that combine resource categories in support of the research and publication activities of professors.

Table 47 presents an accurate picture of the factor structure of resource availability in the total sample. However, it is misleading in that graduate school factors can only be present in those institutions offering graduate degrees. This, plus missing data on some resource categories, substantially reduced the number of cases in the factor analysis. Using listwise deletion for missing data, we were left with only 115 respondents who answered every one of the resource availability questions. To counteract this excessive case attrition, four items that are associated with graduate education and that had the lowest number of respondents in the survey were removed from the matrix and the factor analysis was repeated, this time with complete data from 296 respondents. After three iterations, a two-factor solution was obtained. Table 48 details the loadings of the remaining eleven resource categories on these two factors. Loadings above .50000 appear for seven resource categories on factor one and two resource categories on factor two. Factor one represents the support of research and publications and factor two is the library support factor. Travel to conferences and sabbaticals to improve knowledge are not important components of either of the factors.

Table 48

Factor Analysis[a] of the Availability of Institutional Funds to Support Teaching and Research, Graduate-Level Factors Removed

Activities and Purchases in Support of Teaching and Research	Factors	
	1	2
Travel to conferences	.49579	.42567
Travel to develop grants	.65311	.12339
Research by senior professors	.81204	.09766
Research by untenured professors	.81164	.02530
Purchase of computers	.53614	.09562
Purchase of research equipment	.70536	.22993
Purchase of library books	.11721	.91703
Purchase of library journals	.08891	.91355
Personnel for grant development	.56271	.01896
Sabbaticals to improve knowledge	.39473	.22834
Full professors' salaries	.55664	.20392

N = 296

[a] Rotated factor matrix.

VII

TEACHING AND FORMAL REWARD STRUCTURES FOR FACULTY

The major emphasis in the professional activity of liberal arts faculty is, without question, classroom teaching. Nearly three-quarters of the colleges and universities studied require liberal arts faculty to teach four or more courses a week, and only 7 percent require as few as two courses per week (Table 49). In terms of courseload requirements, there are only 25 institutions in the sample that routinely provide liberal arts faculty with substantial released time for scholarly productivity. Table 50 confirms this with data on the proportion of the faculty's time that is devoted to teaching. All but one of the institutions in which liberal arts faculty teach seven hours per week or less expect the faculty to give more than half of their professional time to activities other than teaching.

The efforts of the faculty are supplemented by part-time instructors in nearly all colleges and universities. These instructors typically have no higher education responsibilities other than teaching one or two courses per semester. It is of considerable concern that one in every six colleges and universities relies on part-time instructors to teach at least a quarter of all liberal arts courses (Table 51). Even worse, 26 institutions teach 40 percent or more of their liberal arts courses with part-time instructors. One wonders whether students are able to find enough professors on the campuses of these institutions to meet their advising and other extracurricular educational needs.

Table 52 shows how these three measures of teaching service delivery vary by institutional type. Teaching load and the proportion of faculty time devoted to teaching are lowest in large, private, urban, graduate

Table 49

Faculty Teaching Load

Faculty Teaching Load	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
7 or fewer hours/week	25	6.8%
8-10 hours/week	73	19.9%
11 or more hours/week	268	73.2%
Total	366	99.9%[a]

[a] Percentages do not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

Table 50

Proportion of the Faculty's Time That is Devoted to Teaching

Faculty Time Devoted to Teaching	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Less than 50%	24	6.5%
50-74%	93	25.1%
75% or more	254	68.5%
Total	371	100.1%[a]

[a] Percentages do not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

Table 51

Proportion of Liberal Arts Courses Taught by Part-Time Instructors

Part-Time Proportion	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Less than 10%	173	47.1%
10-24%	133	36.2%
25-39%	35	9.5%
40 or more %	26	7.1%
N	367	99.9%[a]

[a] Percentages do not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

Table 52

Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Variables Measuring Teaching Effort[a]

	Institutional Characteristics					
Teaching Effort Variables	Highest Degree Offered	Private/ Public	Rural/ Urban	Faculty Size	Student Body	Graduate Student Body
Faculty teaching load	-.28***	-.15***	.13**	-.31***	-.25***	-.23***
Proportion of teaching by part-time intructors	.07	-.08	.29***	-.01	.04	.09*
Proportion of faculty effort for teaching	-.30***	-.12*	-.09*	-.33***	-.22***	-.27***

[a] All Correlations are Tau b.

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

***Statistically significant at less than .001.

institutions. Teaching by part-time instructors is rather evenly distributed across institutional categories. The major influence on the use of part-time instructors is urbanization (see Table 53). Colleges and universities in small towns and rural areas presumably use few part-time instructors because they can not locate qualified individuals in their local communities. This puts them at a decided economic disadvantage at the same time that it benefits their students.

Tables 54 and 55 illustrate the two strongest relationships among those found in Table 52. A heavy teaching load was reported by 83 percent of the chief liberal arts academic officers in institutions employing less than 150 full time equivalent faculty, as compared with 42 percent of the institutions employing 500 or more FTE faculty. A mere handful of the institutions with fewer than 150 FTE faculty require that less than half their professional time be devoted to teaching. This rises to more than a quarter of the largest institutions studied. Table 56 confirms that once faculty size and highest degree offered are entered into the regression equation, none of the other institutional characteristics have a statistically significant influence on the proportion of faculty time devoted to teaching. In Table 57, we see that the greater the emphasis on national reputation in the chief liberal arts academic officer's assessment of liberal arts departments and programs, the lower the proportion of faculty time reserved for teaching. Status in the national higher education community rarely derives from excellence in teaching.

Factors in Tenure Decisions

Six factors which might reasonably be considered in tenure decisions about liberal arts faculty are teaching, research, publications, committee

Table 53

The Relationship Between Urbanization and the Proportion of Liberal Arts Courses Taught By Part-Time Instructors

Teaching by Part-Time Instructors	Urbanization[a]			
	Rural	Small Town	Urban	Metropolitan
Less than 10%	75.9%	56.4%	42.5%	24.4%
10-24%	18.5%	29.1%	44.2%	45.6%
25-39%	1.9%	7.3%	8.8%	17.8%
40% or more	3.7%	7.3%	4.4%	12.2%
N	54	110	113	90

Tau b = .29, statistically significant at less than .001.

[a] Column percentages may not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

Table 54

The Relationship Between Faculty Size and Faculty Teaching Load

Faculty Teaching Load	Faculty Size Less than 150	150-499	500 or More
7 or fewer hours	3.7%	10.4%	17.8%
8-10 hours	13.2%	27.3%	40.0%
11 or more hours	83.1%	62.3%	42.2%
N	242	77	45

Tau b = .31, statistically significant at less than .001.

Table 55

The Relationship Between Faculty Size and the Proportion of the Faculty's Time That is Devoted to Teaching

	Faculty Size[a]		
Proportion of Faculty Time for Teaching	Less than 150	150-499	500 or More
Less than 50%	2.0%	8.9%	26.1%
50-74%	19.3%	34.2%	39.1%
75% or more	78.7%	57.0%	34.8%
N	244	79	46

Tau b = -.33, significant at less than .001 statistically.

[a] Column percentages may not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

Table 56

Regression of the Proportion of Faculty Effort Devoted to Teaching on Selected Institutional Characteristics and Conditions

Independent Variables	Multiple Correlation	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta Weight	T
Faculty size	.37	-.193	.059	-.230	-3.274**
Highest degree offered	.41	-.192	.060	-.226	-3.222**
Constant		3.230	.095		33.952***

N = 280

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

***Statistically significant at less than .001.

Variables failing to meet the minimum criteria for inclusion in the equation:

Private/public
Urbanization of setting
Student body size
Graduate student body size

Table 57

Relationship Between the Importance of a National Reputation in Department and Program Evaluations by the Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officer and the Proportion of Faculty Time Devoted to Teaching

	Importance of a National Reputation[a]			
Proportion of Faculty Time Devoted to Teaching	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Less than 50 percent	1.4%	1.7%	7.0%	21.0%
50-74 percent	12.9%	29.1%	30.7%	22.6%
75 percent or more	85.7%	69.2%	62.3%	56.5%
N	70	117	114	62

Tau b = -.20, statistically significant at less than .001.

[a] Column percentages may not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

assignments and other services to the organization, involvement with external professional organizations, and service to the external community. The weighting of these six factors in tenure decisions is summarized in Table 58. Percentages in the table have been calculated across the rows for each tenure factor rather than down the columns for each tenure weight. The mean weight (ranked with 1.0 as most important) for teaching is 1.1, with an overwhelming 92 percent of the chief liberal arts academic officers citing it as the most important factor in tenure decisions. Although committee work is less likely than research or publications to be the most important tenure factor, it is more likely than the other tenure factors to be weighted as the second most important factor in tenure decisions. The mean weights for the tenure factors which are less important than teaching are: institutional service (2.9), research (3.1), publications (3.4), professional organization involvement (4.3) and community service (4.4).

We learn from Table 59 that teaching and institutional service are likely to have great importance in small, rural, private, undergraduate institutions, while research and publications are most highly favored in large, urban, public, graduate institutions. Tenure weights for involvement in professional organizations and community service are unrelated to these institutional characteristics, except for a slight tendency for community service to be more highly weighted in small than large institutions.

Tables 60, 61 and 62 are intended to reveal some of the more interesting associations between tenure weights and related institutional conditions and orientations. If a college or university emphasizes research in tenure decisions, one would expect to find a high level of internal funding for research by untenured professors. This expectation is

Table 58

Relative Weights of Factors in Tenure Decisions

Factor	Weight						Total[a]
	1 (Highest)	2	3	4	5	6 (Lowest)	
Teaching	91.5%	5.2%	2.9%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	99.9%
Research	7.9%	34.2%	24.7%	11.7%	12.7%	8.9%	100.0%
Publication	8.7%	26.8%	22.6%	17.1%	12.6%	12.3%	100.0%
Institutional Service	0.6%	47.7%	23.1%	19.5%	6.4%	2.7%	100.0%
Prof. organizations	4.9%	21.7%	28.0%	27.6%	17.4%	0.3%	99.9%
Community service	0.3%	6.1%	27.5%	16.3%	22.0%	27.8%	100.0%
Total							

[a] Row percentages may not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

Table 59

Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and the Weighting of Factors in Tenure Decisions

	Institutional Characteristics[a]					
Tenure Factors	Highest Degree Offered	Private/ Public	Rural/ Urban	Faculty Size	Student Body	Graduate Student Body
Teaching	-.30***	-.24***	-.14**	-.39***	-.27***	-.24***
Research	.32***	.28***	.16***	.42***	.39***	.32***
Publications	.34***	.24***	.18***	.41***	.37***	.30***
Institutional service	-.24***	-.32***	-.13**	-.39***	-.36***	-.22***
Prof. organization involvement	.05	-.06	-.04	.04	.00	.05
Community Service	-.08	-.04	-.06	-.08	-.16***	-.08*

[a] All correlations are Tau b.

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

***Statistically significant at less than .001.

Table 60

Relationship Between the Weighting of Research in Tenure Decisions and the Availability of Funds for Research by Untenured Professors

Availability of Funds for Research by Untenured Professors	Weighting of Research[a]					
	1 (Highest)	2	3	4	5	6 (Lowest)
Good or excellent	62.5%	37.0%	27.6%	18.8%	10.3%	0.0%
Fair	20.8%	41.7%	39.5%	34.4%	38.5%	26.9%
Poor	16.7%	21.3%	32.9%	46.9%	51.3%	73.1%
N	24	108	76	32	39	26

Tau b = .33, statistically significant at less than .001.

[a] Column percentages may not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

Table 61

Relationship Between the Importance of a National Reputation in the Dean's Evaluation of Departments and Program and the Weighting of Publications in Tenure Decisions

Weighting of Publications in Tenure Decisions	Importance of a National Reputation[a]			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
6 (least important)	15.1%	15.0%	12.5%	5.6%
5	15.1%	14.0%	11.5%	9.3%
4	28.3%	16.0%	12.5%	14.8%
3	20.8%	27.0%	24.0%	14.8%
2	20.8%	22.0%	32.3%	31.5%
1 (most important)	0.0%	6.0%	7.3%	24.1%
N	53	100	96	54

Tau b = .20, statistically significant at less than .001.

[a] Column percentages may not sum 100.0 due to standard rounding procedures.

Table 62

Relationship Between the Importance of Publications in Department and Program Evaluations by Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers and the Weighting of Publications in Tenure Decisions

Weighting of Publications in Tenure Decisions	Importance of Publications in Program Evaluations			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
6 (least important)	25.0%	17.4%	6.2%	0.0%
5	31.3%	15.9%	7.2%	0.0%
4	15.6%	24.6%	14.4%	0.0%
3	12.5%	22.5%	27.8%	20.5%
2	15.6%	19.6%	35.1%	35.9%
1 (most important)	0.0%	0.0%	9.3%	43.6%
N	32	138	97	39

Tau b = .44, statistically significant at less than .001.

confirmed in Table 60, with a correlation of .33 between the two variables. Unfortunately for many untenured professors, the availability of funds for their research was poor in approximately a quarter of the institutions in which research was the first, second, or third most important factor in tenure decisions. Table 61 demonstrates that the greater the chief liberal arts academic officer's emphasis on a national reputation in program and department evaluations, the higher the weighting of publications in tenure decisions. Table 62 shows a parallel but much stronger relationship between the importance of publications in department evaluations and the weighting of publications in tenure decisions. Once again, the number of institutions in which there is a major inconsistency between one policy and another, at least when translated into "policy in action," is disturbingly large.

Regressions of institutional characteristics on the weighting of teaching and research in tenure decisions are found in Table 63 and 64. The multiple correlation for teaching reaches .45, based on two measures of institutional size plus highest degree offered. Highest degree offered drops out of the research regression, but the two measures of institutional size remaining are able to produce a multiple correlation of .49 with the weighting of research in tenure decisions.

Merit Salary Increases

Most institutions utilize merit salary increases to recognize and reward outstanding job performance by professors. The questionnaire on liberal arts administration included queries on the use of merit salary raises for teaching, research, and public service. Nearly two-thirds of the institutions made merit salary awards for excellence in teaching, half

Table 63

Regression of the Weighting of Teaching in Tenure Decisions on Selected Institutional Characteristics and Conditions

Independent Variable	Multiple Correlatioin	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta Weight	T
Faculty size	.41	-.147	.029	-.382	-5.127***
Highest degree offered	.43	-.139	.042	-.357	-3.292**
Graduate student body	.45	.107	.044	.281	2.413
Constant		.805	.043		8.605***

N = 280

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

***Statistically significant at less than .001.

Variables failing to meet the minimum criteria for inclusion in the equation:

Private/public
Urbanization
Student body size

Table 64

Regression of the Weighting of Research in Tenure Decisions on Selected Institutional Characteristics and Conditions

Independent Variable	Multiple Correlation	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta Weight	T
Student body size	.47	.451	.125	.314	3.607***
Faculty size	.49	.376	.166	.197	2.262*
Constant		4.701	.193		24.343***

N = 280

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

***Statistically significant at less than .01.

Variables failing to meet the minimum criteria for inclusion in the equation:

Highest degree offered
Private/public
Urbanization
Graduate student body size

rewarded research productivity in this way, and just over a third took public service into account in merit salary determinations (see Table 65). Both teaching and research are more likely to be recognized through merit salary adjustments in institutions that are large, public, and graduate. The effects of these characteristics are greater on research than teaching merit salary awards. Community service follows the same pattern, except that it is unrelated to highest degree offered (see Table 66).

The effects of faculty size on merit raises for excellence in teaching and in research are displayed in Tables 67 and 68. The use of merit salaries for teaching rises from 59 percent in the smallest institutions to 84 percent in the largest institutions. The corresponding increase for research is from 36 percent to 80 percent. Faculty size drops out and is replaced by student body size in the regressions of teaching and research merit awards on institutional characteristics that are found in Tables 69 and 70. Student body size is joined by private/public institutional sponsorship in producing a multiple correlation of .30 with teaching merit salary awards and a multiple correlation of .39 with research merit salary awards.

Table 71 informs readers of the results of a factor analysis carried out with six factors in tenure decisions and three types of merit salary raises. It was expected that factors would be extracted to represent a teaching emphasis and a research emphasis in formal faculty reward structures. The actual results after four iterations of the varimax program are very different from this expectation. Factor one has high loadings on the four tenure variables of teaching, research, publications, and institutional service. Factor two is loaded most highly on the three merit salary award variables, and factor three consists mainly of loadings

Table 65

Use of Merit Salary Increases to Encourage Excellence[a]

Criteria	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Teaching	231	65.8%
Research	163	50.3%
Public Service	113	35.4%

[a] Categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table 66

Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and the Use of Merit Salary Increases to Reward Excellence in Teaching, Research, and Community Service

Merit Salary Variables	Institutional Characteristics[a]					
	Highest Degree Offered	Private/ Public	Rural/ Urban	Faculty Size	Student Body	Graduate Student Body
Teaching	.14**	.26***	.02	.20***	.23***	.14**
Research	.29***	.35***	.08	.37***	.37***	.27***
Community service	.08	.29***	.03	.18***	.22***	.11*

[a] All correlations are Tau b.

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

***Statistically significant at less than .001.

Table 67

The Relationship Between Faculty Size and the Use of Merit Salary Increases for Teaching

Teaching Merit Salary Increases	Faculty Size		
	Less than 150	150-499	500 or More
No	40.9%	24.0%	15.9%
Yes	59.1%	76.0%	84.1%
N	230	75	44

Tau b = .20, statistically significant at less than .001.

Table 68

The Relationship Between Faculty Size and the Use of Merit Salary Increases for Research

Research Merit Salary Increases	Faculty Size		
	Less than 150	150-499	500 or More
No	64.4%	26.0%	20.5%
Yes	35.6%	74.0%	79.5%
N	205	73	44

Tau b = .37, statistically significant at less than .001.

Table 69

Regression of Merit Salary Increases for Teaching on Selected Institutional Characteristics and Conditions

Independent Variable	Multiple Correlation	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta Weight	T
Student body size	.27	.086	.033	.181	2.604**
Private/public	.30	.096	.042	.159	2.291*
Constant		1.270	.084		15.207***

N = 280

* Statistically significant at less than .05.

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

***Statistically significant at less than .001.

Variables failing to meet the minimum criteria for inclusion in the equation:

Highest degree offered
Urbanization
Faculty size
Graduate student body size

Table 70

Regression of Merit Salary Increases for Research on Selected Institutional Characteristics and Conditions

Independent Variable	Multiple Correlation	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Beta Weight	T
Student body size	.36	.134	.034	.264	3.946***
Private/public	.39	.113	.043	.176	2.629**
Constant		.996	.086		11.616***

N = 280

** Statistically significant at less than .01.

*** Statistically significant at less than .001.

Variables failing to meet the minimum criteria for inclusion in the equation:
Highest degree offered
Urbanization
Faculty size
Graduate student body size

Table 71

Factor Analysis[a] of Variables in Tenure Decisions and the Use of Merit Salary Increases

	Factors		
Variables	1	2	3
Tenure weight-teaching	-.71475	.02997	.12466
Tenure weight-research	.73659	.22596	.10444
Tenure weight-publication	.80938	.10693	.04648
Tenure weight-institutional service	-.72390	-.14432	-.33879
Tenure weight-prof. organizations	.12733	-.02263	-.89290
Tenure weight-community service	-.33289	-.03498	-.56356
Merit salary-teaching	.07299	.87982	-.00009
Merit salary-research	.31875	.84693	.07702
Merit salary-community service	-.00008	.81739	.02819

N = 254

[a] Rotated factor matrix.

on professional organization involvement and community service variables in tenure decisions. This factor structure is primarily due to three influences in the correlation matrix from which the factor analysis was generated.

First, the forced choice formatting of the tenure weight questions tended to enhance correlations within that group of variables. Second, the three merit salary variables have very high intercorrelations. Institutions that are willing and able to make merit salary awards for one dimension of professorial performance are very likely to make them for all three performance categories. Finally, the correlations between parallel tenure and merit salary reward categories were generally lower than the correlations among the tenure variables alone and much lower than the intercorrelations among the merit salary variables.

The Inconsistency Among Resources, Standards, and Rewards in Colleges and Universities

At various points in this monograph, there have been indications of inconsistencies in the relationships between resources, standards, and rewards in the institutions studied. Table 72 presents eight relationships from the set of partial and complete correspondences between (1) the chief liberal arts academic officer's department and program evaluations and (2) the weighting of factors in tenure decisions. The correlations vary from .44 to -.11, hardly an impressive demonstration of institutional consistency. Even the highest correlations in the set reveal massive inconsistencies. The highest correlation, .44, is based on 212 consistent and 94 inconsistent cases. The .40 correlation which is second in line is derived from 214 consistent and 98 inconsistent cases. Faculty in

Table 72

Selected Relationships Among Evaluation Standards

Bivariate Relationships	Correlations	Significance Levels
Importance of publications in dept./program evaluations x Weighting of publications in tenure decisions	.44	.001
Importance of grants in dept./program evaluations x Weighting of research in tenure decisions	.40	.001
Importance of papers delivered at professional meetings in dept./program evaluations x Weighting of research in tenure decisions	.27	.001
Importance of teaching quality in dept./program evaluations x Weighting of teaching quality in tenure decisions	.22	.001
Importance of student attrition in dept./program evaluations x Weighting of teaching quality in tenure decisions	.17	.001
Importance of student job placement in dept./program evaluations x Weighting of teaching quality in tenure decisions	.04	NS
Importance of conferences or workshops given in dept./program evaluations x Weighting of involvement with external professional organizations in tenure decisions	.00	NS
Importance of conferences or workshops given in dept./program evaluations x Weighting of community service in tenure decisions	-.11	.05

many institutions are receiving mixed messages about the priority various activities should be given in their professional lives.

Universities and colleges are complex, partially integrated institutions. Closely related decisions are not necessarily made by the same administrators and faculty committees. Formal criteria may be lacking, or at least inconsistent. Power is so diffuse in most institutions of higher education that no single administrator or committee has the capability of bringing these various decision-making processes into conformity with a common set of standards. In fact, the doctrine of separation of powers is held so dearly on many campuses that any attempt to improve the situation would be viewed by faculty as subversive of academic freedom and the traditions of college life. We believe that much of the cynicism and burnout found among professors derives from these inconsistencies. Despite the strength of the opposition and the difficulty of the task, it is worth the effort for administrators to work toward a very high degree of consistency among standards, rewards, and resource allocation patterns in American colleges and universities.

A Note About Faculty Unionization

Eighty-two of the chief liberal arts academic officers reported that the liberal arts faculty at their institution was unionized. This seemed too high a proportion of the sample, and a check of the Directory of Faculty Contracts of Bargaining Agents in Institutions of Higher Education (Joel M. Douglas, National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions, Baruch College, CUNY, 1984) revealed that 49 of the institutions actually had collective bargaining contracts in force at the time of the study. It turned out, upon further analysis, that many active chapters of the American Association of University Professors were being mistaken for faculty unions in the strict sense. Using either the 82-case variable or the 49-case variable, unionization was very weakly related to most of the other variables in the study, the typical relationship not differing from zero at a statistically significant level.

Unionization was concentrated in the larger public colleges and universities of the sample. There was no consistent pattern of relationships to suggest that resource deprivation was a causal factor in the unionization process, a tentative proposition that had emerged from our earlier research on graduate schools. Such a pattern of relationships was also lacking for all of the teaching variables, tenure weights, and merit salary increase factors discussed in this chapter. For this sample of graduate and undergraduate institutions, there was no evidence that unionization is particularly helpful or harmful to teachers or researchers. Judging from the absence of references to unions among the major frustrations listed by the chief liberal arts academic officers, unionization was not much of a problem for administrators either.

VIII

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is a summary of the findings of a recent national study of liberal arts education conducted at IUP's Institute for Advanced Research. The study is unusual in the definition of its sampling frame as American chief liberal arts academic officers and in its subject matter as the careers, occupational experiences, and professional behavior of the liberal arts administrators and their reports about institutional resources and rewards used to support excellence in liberal arts teaching and liberal arts research.

A national universe of 1,476 chief liberal arts academic officers was constructed out of several lists provided by Peterson's Distribution Services, with further investigation where appropriate. Questionnaires were sent to a 50 percent random sample in spring 1984. By the cutoff date for inclusion in the study, 371 of the 738 chief liberal arts academic officers had returned usable questionnaires, for a return rate of 50 percent.

Sixty-three (17 percent) of the sampled institutions offer doctorates, 163 (44 percent) offer master's and bachelor's degrees, and 145 (39 percent) are undergraduate institutions. Twenty-five percent of the institutions are church-related, 41 percent are independent private institutions, and 34 percent are public colleges and universities. The rural-urban geographical distribution of the institutions is fairly balanced, with 15 percent located in rural environments, 30 percent in small towns, 31 percent in urban environments, and 25 percent in metropolitan areas (standard rounding procedures sometimes produce percentages that do not sum 100). More than a quarter of the institutions enroll 1,000 or fewer students and over a third have between 1,001 and 2,500 students. Large institutions are much fewer in number, 29 having 10,001 to 20,000 students and 17 enrolling in excess of 20,000 students.

In the small liberal arts college, the liberal arts unit usually comprises the entire college. The comprehensive university, by comparison, contains a number of colleges and schools, of which but one is typically the administrative home of the liberal arts. Department chairs in the larger universities may be considered to be administrators and have more than half of their time formally dedicated for administrative purposes. At the other end of the continuum, chairs of small departments in liberal arts colleges have few real administrative duties and receive no "release time" to compensate them for their departmental responsibilities. In conducting this study, we abandoned an easily identifiable organizational framework in favor of a conceptual restructuring of traditional approaches to research in higher education. This allowed for the inclusion of noncomparable organizational forms in the same sample on the basis of similarity of function, the essential function being liberal arts educational service delivery.

Chief Liberal Arts Academic Officers

The chief liberal arts academic officers in the sample had worked in their current positions for an average of just under five years. They held many different titles, with relatively little consistency from one institution to another. Forty-six distinct titles were reported by the respondents. It was possible to classify almost all of these 46 titles into three generic groups of job titles: 43 percent of the chief liberal arts academic officers were liberal arts deans, 14 percent were arts and sciences deans, and 40 percent were vice-presidents (including provosts).

The most common doctoral degree discipline of the chief liberal arts academic officer was in the physical sciences or mathematics. Education was the second most common doctoral degree area. Only after that did the traditional humanities of English (as well as other languages) and history appear. Four out of every five chief liberal arts academic officers received their doctoral degrees in a liberal arts discipline, but less than half of their doctorates were in the traditional humanities and fine arts.

More than one out of every five chief liberal arts academic officers defined his or her current salary as indicating a fairly or very low level of salary success relative to academics of the same age and qualifications. Most thought they were fairly successful in salary terms. The reports for self-defined career success (reflecting position and status in higher education rather than financial remuneration) were slightly more positive. Twenty-nine percent of the chief liberal arts academic officers believed their careers to be very successful, 56 percent fairly successful, 4 percent fairly unsuccessful, and 12 percent very unsuccessful. There were no administrators who judged their impact on the quality of education at their institution to be zero, but just over one in five felt they were able to have an impact on education at the institution to only a limited degree, presumably due to factors such as budget limitations and competition from other administrators within the institution. Slightly more than a third of the chief liberal arts academic officers reported that they had very much of an impact on the quality of education in their own academic settings.

Despite relatively high opinions of their present situations, 69 percent of the respondents thought they would probably leave the position of chief liberal arts academic officer at some time in the future, mostly to return to teaching and research (31 percent), or to advance to another administrative position in higher education (43 percent). The remaining respondents hoped to combine teaching, research, and administration in some future position, perhaps with an emphasis on consulting. Only a handful predicted that they would eventually move into private industry.

It is important to note that the chief liberal arts academic officer's feelings about the institution are at the same positive level in large universities and small colleges, in rural and urban settings, and in public as well as private institutions of higher education. However, high salary success and high educational impact are most likely to be found in very different kinds of institutions. High salary success is most likely to be found in large public institutions offering doctorates, while high educational impact is most likely to be found in small to medium-sized private, undergraduate institutions.

Administering the Liberal Arts

Most (61 percent) chief liberal arts academic officers serve in their administrative posts at the pleasure of the president or another administrator beyond their own level, 27 percent receive "automatic" annual contracts, and 8 percent receive contracts for a specific number of years (the most common interval being five years). This limited job security in an administrative role is supplemented by tenured faculty backup positions for the majority (57 percent) of the chief liberal arts academic officers.

A very high percentage of chief liberal arts academic officers receive advice on matters of academic policy and curriculum from faculty committees.

Faculty committees providing advice on other matters are much less common. The advice they receive from faculty committees is not taken lightly. Only six administrators followed the advice of their faculty advisory committees less than half the time, and the median acceptance of faculty committee advice was close to 90 percent.

The chief liberal arts academic officer has signature authority for extramural grants in less than half the colleges and universities studied. This is one of a number of areas in which the chief liberal arts academic officer's control over important operations in the liberal arts unit is attentuated in a surprisingly large number of institutions. A related point is that chief liberal arts academic officers administer institutional research support funds within the liberal arts unit in just over half of the institutions.

Chief liberal arts academic officers are so busy with their administrative responsibilities that it is difficult for them to find time for teaching. Most of them teach either one or two courses per year, and more than a third of these liberal arts administrators never teach at all. Chief liberal arts academic officers spend most of their time in conferences with faculty and other administrators, formal committee meetings, and personnel matters.

The rank-order correlation between actual and ideal time usage by chief liberal arts academic officers is .73, which indicates a substantial correspondence between what the respondents do in their daily routine and what they believe they should be doing in their professional lives. The largest discrepancies between ideal and actual time usage are for personal research, professional reading, curriculum development, and formal committee meetings. Chief liberal arts academic officers feel they do not have enough time for the first three activities, and that formal committee meetings take up too much of their time.

The chief liberal arts academic officers cited formal committee meetings as taking 40 percent more of their time than they would like to devote to committee work. There is a dilemma in these data. They feel they spend too much time in committee meetings, yet they are not well represented on most major committees. It is not unreasonable to argue that these administrators, as major advocates for excellence in higher education, should increase their presence on bodies such as the library committee, the graduate council, and the major equipment committee.

Approximately a third of the chief liberal arts academic officers in the sample are never evaluated. Less than half of them receive regular annual evaluations, and a small number are evaluated at intervals of two, three, or four years. Faculty members become involved in the evaluations of less than a quarter of the chief liberal arts academic officers. Department chairs are even less likely to be consulted. The consumer approach to educational service delivery, now so common in the form of student course evaluations, has not yet reached the higher administrators in most of the institutions included in the study.

The three most important job satisfactions reported by chief liberal arts academic officers are (1) working with faculty, staff, and administrators, (2) program development, and (3) personal factors. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents cited one of these three factors as the most satisfying aspect of their job. The major job frustrations associated with leading the liberal arts academic community are (1) budget, (2) time constraints, and an item that was listed as the most important job satisfaction, (3) working with faculty, staff, and administrators.

Resources are not evenly allocated among these programs. Chief liberal arts academic officers, like other academic administrators, are much more likely to favor their strongest programs than to allocate resources to their weakest programs in an attempt to build them up. The opinions chief liberal arts academic officers hold about many of the departments and programs under their supervision are strongly positive. Fifty-nine percent of the administrators judged one-fifth or more of their departments and programs to be outstanding and 71 percent felt that at least half of their departments and programs were good, although not outstanding. Only a small proportion of the administrators studied gave top priority to upgrading fair (10 percent) or inferior (6 percent) programs. It appears that the star system dominates the resource allocation patterns of the overwhelming majority of chief liberal arts academic officers. To paraphrase the title of a classic book on American poverty, the best get better and the worst get worse. This policy, when followed over an extended period of time, leads to the peaks and valleys of quality in educational service delivery which characterize departments at so many colleges and universities today.

Department and Program Evaluations

The average department or program in the study was evaluated once every five years. Very few were never evaluated, and 82 (22 percent) were formally evaluated every year. The chief liberal arts officers' use of fourteen distinct dimensions of excellence in evaluating programs and departments under their control was studied. The most important factors in the assessment of programs and departments by chief liberal arts academic officers are teaching quality, internal reputation, the number and level of content of course offerings, the student attrition rate, and the size and quality of the accepted student applicant pool. Research-related factors, which are often thought to be overemphasized in American colleges and universities, were reported to be far less important than teaching-related factors in department and program evaluations.

In general, evaluation factors related to scholarly productivity are more highly differentiated by institutional type than are factors related to teaching or reputation. Chief liberal arts academic officers are likely to consider research and scholarship to be important in institutions that are large, private, graduate, and urban. Teaching factors are less strongly correlated with institutional characteristics than are research factors, and the correlations are consistently in the opposite direction. Institutions in which the chief liberal arts academic officers attach particular importance to teaching variables in their assessment of programs and departments tend to be private, small, undergraduate, and rural. Nearly half of the institutions in which publications are very important offer full professors' salaries that are good or very good, and none of them pay their full professors very poor salaries. What a contrast there is with institutions in which publications are not important. Fully 60 percent of these institutions provide their full professors with salaries that are poor or very poor.

Funding for Excellence

Library books, graduate courses, library journals, computer purchases, and sabbaticals for both knowledge acquisition and research are more likely than other categories of support for teaching and research to be adequately funded in liberal arts units. The support categories least likely to receive good or excellent funding are research graduate assistants, travel to develop grants, grant development personnel, research by senior professors, research by untenured professors, and the purchase of research equipment. It is commonly said that teaching is underfunded in comparison with research at many American colleges and universities. Our conclusion is quite the opposite, that teaching support is far more likely to be adequate than support for research and scholarship in most colleges and universities.

Institutions that have funds to support excellence in research also are likely to allocate substantial funding for teaching support. Liberal arts teachers in strongly research-oriented institutions may find themselves in the strange position of receiving excellent support to develop their teaching skills and subject matter competencies while simultaneously receiving little recognition for their teaching achievements in department evaluations. Many of them would probably prefer to trade some of their resources for increased professional respect and appreciation of their performance as teachers.

Teaching Versus Research in the Liberal Arts

The major emphasis in the professional activity of liberal arts faculty is, without question, classroom teaching. Nearly three-quarters of the colleges and universities studied require liberal arts faculty to teach four or more courses a week, and only 7 percent require as few as two courses per week. In terms of courseload requirements, there are only 25 institutions in the sample that routinely provide liberal arts faculty with substantial released time for scholarly productivity. The greater the emphasis on national reputation in the chief liberal arts academic officer's assessment of liberal arts departments and programs, the lower the proportion of faculty time reserved for teaching. Status in the national higher education community rarely derives from excellence in teaching.

The efforts of the faculty are supplemented by part-time instructors in nearly all colleges and universities. These instructors typically have no higher education responsibilities other than teaching one or two courses per semester. It is of considerable concern that one in every six colleges and universities relies on part-time instructors to teach at least a quarter of all liberal arts courses. Even worse, 26 institutions teach 40 percent or more of their liberal arts courses with part-time instructors. One wonders whether students are able to find enough professors on the campuses of these institutions to meet their advising and other extracurricular educational needs.

Six factors which might reasonably be considered in tenure decisions about liberal arts faculty are teaching, research, publications, committee assignments and other services to the organization, involvement with external professional organizations, and service to the larger community. The mean weight for teaching is 1.1, with an overwhelming 92 percent of the chief liberal arts academic officers citing it as the most important factor in tenure decisions. The mean weights for the tenure factors which are less important than teaching are: institutional service (2.9), research (3.1), publications (3.4), professional organization involvement (4.3) and community service (4.4). Teaching and institutional service are likely to have great importance in small, rural, private, undergraduate institutions, while research and publications are most highly favored in large, urban, public, graduate institutions.

Unfortunately for many untenured professors, the availability of funds for their research is poor in approximately a quarter of the institutions in which research is the first, second, or third most important factor in tenure decisions. The greater the chief liberal arts academic officer's emphasis on a national reputation in program and department evaluation, the higher the weighting of publications in tenure decisions. There is a much stronger relationship between the importance of publications in department evaluations and the weighting of publications in tenure decisions. Once again, the number of institutions in which there is a major inconsistency between one policy and another, at least when translated into "policy in action," is disturbingly large.

Most institutions utilize merit salary increases to recognize and reward outstanding job performance by professors. Nearly two-thirds of the institutions studied make merit salary awards for excellence in teaching, half reward research productivity in this way, and just over a third take public service into account in merit salary determinations. Both teaching and research are more likely to be recognized through merit salary adjustments in institutions that are large, public, and graduate. The effects of these characteristics are greater on research than teaching merit salary awards.

A Plea for Consistency

At various points in our research there have been indications of inconsistencies in the relationships between resources, standards, and rewards in the institutions studied. Faculty in many institutions are receiving mixed messages about the priority various activities should be given in their professional lives. Despite the relatively higher support given to teaching as compared with research in many institutions, we believe that these mixed messages have their most deleterious effects on the teaching enterprise.

Universities and colleges are complex, partially integrated institutions. Closely related decisions are not necessarily made by the same administrators and faculty committees. Formal criteria may be lacking, or at least inconsistent. Power is so diffuse in most institutions of higher education that no single administrator or committee has the capability of bringing these various decision-making processes into conformity with a common set of standards. In fact, the doctrine of separation of powers is held so dearly on many campuses that any attempt to improve the situation would be viewed by faculty as subversive of academic freedom and the traditions of college life. We believe that much of the cynicism and burnout found among professors derives from these inconsistencies. Notwithstanding the strength of the opposition and the difficulty of the task, it is worth the effort for administrators to work toward a very high degree of consistency among standards, rewards, and resource allocation patterns in American colleges and universities.

iup

Indiana University
of Pennsylvania

Indiana, Pa.
15705
412-357-2222